National Anti-Slavery Standard.

S. H. GAY, OLIVER JOHNSON, } ..... Editors.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, Corresponding Editor.

VOL. XIV. NO. 50. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1854. WHOLE NO. 726.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, on Saturday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK. Terms, *Two Dollars* per annum. Printed, for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street, New York.

Congress.

SPEECH OF COL. BENTON,

ON THE

NEBRASKA BILL,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, April 25th, 1854.

[Reported for The Washington Globe.]

THE House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. Chandler in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the committee is on the Senate amendments to the Deficiency bill; and on that question the member from Miesissippi [Mr. Harris] has still the floor.

Mr. HARRIS not availing himself of his right,

Mr. BENTON. If any bill to impair the Missouri compromise line of 1820 had been brought into this House by a member from a slave State, or under the administration of a President elected from a slave State, I should have deemed it my duty to have met it at the threshold, and to have made the motion which the parliamentary law prescribes for the repulse of subjects which are not fit to be considered: I should have moved its rejection at the first reading. But the bill before us, for the two may be considered as one, does not come from that quarter. It comes from a free State, and under the administration of a President elected from a free State; and under that aspect of its origin, I deemed it right to wait, and hear what the members of the free States had to say to it. It was a proposition from their own ranks, to give up their half of the Slavery compromise of 1820; and if they chose to do so, I did not see how southern members could refuse to accept it. It was a free State question; and the members from the free States were the majority, and could do as they pleased. So I stood aloof, waiting to see their lead, but without the slightest intention of being governed by it. I had my own convictions of right and duty, and meant to act upon them. I had come into political life upon that compromise. I had stood upon it above thirty years, and intended to stand upon it to the end—solitary and alone, if need be; but preferring company to solitude, and not doubting for an instant what the result was to be.

I have said that this bill comes into Congress under the administration of a free State President; but I do not mean to say, or insinuate by that remark, that the President favours the bill. I know nothing of his disposition towards it; and if I did, I should not disclose it here. It would be unparliamentary, and a breach of the privileges of this House, to do so. The President's opinions can only be made known to us by himself, in a message in writing. In that way it is his right, and often his duty, to communicate with us. And in that way there is no room for mistake in citing his opinions; no room for an unauthorized use of his name; no room for the imputation of contradictory opinions to him; and in that way he becomes responsible to the American people for the opinions he may deliver. All other modes of communication are forbid to him, as tending to an undue and unconstitutional interference with the freedom of legislation. It is not bribery alone attempted upon a member which constitutes a breach of the privileges of this House. It is any attempt to operate upon a member's vote by any consideration of hope or fear, favour or affection, prospect of reward or dread of punishment. This is parliamentary law, as old as English Parliaments, constantly maintained by the British House of Commons, and lately declared in a most signal manner. It was during the reign of our old master, George the Third, and in the famous case of Mr. Fox's East India bill. A report was spread in Parliament by one of the lords of the bed-chamber, that the King was opposed to the bill; that he wished it defeated; and had said that he would consider any member his enemy who should vote for it. The House of Commons took fire at this report, and immediately resolved:

"That to report any opinion, or pretended opinion, of his Majesty, upon any bill depending in either House of Parliament, is a high crime and misdemeanour, derogatory to the honour of the crown, a breach of the fundamental privileges of Parliament, and subversive of the Constitution of the country."

This resolve was adopted in a full House by a majority of seventy-three votes, and was only declaratory of existing parliamentary law—such as it had existed from the time that English counties and boroughs first sent knights of the shire and burgesses to represent them in the Parliament House. It is old English parliamentary law, and is so recorded by Hatsell, and all the writers on that law. It is also American law, as old as our Congress; and, as such, recorded in Jefferson's Manual. It is honest law; and as such existent in every honest heart. Sir, the President of the United States can send us no opinions except in written messages, and no one can report his opinions to influence the conduct of members upon a bill, without becoming obnoxious to the censure which the British House of Commons pronounced upon the lord of the bed-chamber, in the case of the King and the Fox East India bill.

Nor can the President's Secretaries—his head clerks, as Mr. Randolph used to call them—send us their opinions on any subject of legislation depending before us. They can only report, and that in writing, on the subjects referred to them by law or by a vote of the Houses. Non-intervention is their duty in relation to our legislation; and if they attempt to intervene in any of our business, I must be allowed, for one, to repulse the attempt, and to express for it no higher degree of respect than that Mr. Burke expressed for the opinions of a British Lord Chancellor, delivered to the House of Commons, in a case in which he had no concern. Sir, I suppose I can be allowed to repeat on this floor any degree of comparison, or figure of speech which Mr. Burke could use on the floor of the British House of Commons. He was a classic speaker, and, besides that, author of a treatise on the Sublime and Beautiful; though I do not consider the particular figure which I have to repeat, although just and picturesque in itself, to be a perfect illustration of either branch of his admired treatise. It was in reference to Lord Thurlow, who had intervened in some legislative business contrary to the orator's sense of right and decency. Mr. Burke repulsed the intrusive opinion, and declared that he did not care three jumps of a louse for it. Sir, I say the same of any opinion which may be reported here from our Secretaries on any bill depending before us, and that in any form in which it may come from them—whether as a unit or as integers.

Still less do I admit the right of intervention in our legislative duties in another class of intermeddlers, and who might not be able to meddle at all with our business were it not for the ministration of our bounty. I speak of the public printers, who get their daily bread (and that buttered on both sides) by our daily printing; and who require the Democratic members of this House, under the instant penalty of political damnation, to give in their adhesion to every bill which they call administration; and that in every change it may undergo—although more changeable than the moon. For that class of intermeddlers I have no parliamentary law to administer, nor any quotation from Burke to apply—nothing but a little fable to read; the value of which, as in all good fables, lies in its moral. It is in French, and entitled "*L'ane et son maitre*," which, being done into English, signifies "*The ass and his master*," and runs thus:

"An ass took it into his head to scare his master, and put on a lion's skin, and went and stood in the path. And when he saw his master coming, he commenced roaring, as he thought; but he only brayed, and the master knew it was his ass: so he went up to him with a cudgel, and beat him nearly to death."

That is the end of the fable, and the moral of it is, "a caution to all asses to take care how they undertake to scare their masters" (great applause).

Mr. Chairman, this House will have fallen far below its constitutional mission if it suffers itself to be governed by authority, or dragooned by its own hirelings. I am a man of no bargains, but act openly with any man that acts for the public good; and in this spirit, I offer the right hand of political friendship to every member of this body that will stand together to vindicate its privileges, protect its respectability, and maintain it in the high place for which it was intended—the master branch of the American Government.

The question before us is to get rid of the Missouri compromise line; and to a lawyer that is an easy question. That compromise is in the form of a statute; and one statute is repealable by another. That short view is enough for a lawyer. To a statesman it is something different; and refers the question of its repeal, not to law books, but to reasons of State policy—to the circumstances under which it was enacted, and the consequences which are to flow from its abrogation. This compromise of 1820 is not a mere statute, to last for a day; it was intended for perpetuity, and so declared itself. It is an enactment to settle a controversy—and did settle it—and cannot be abrogated without reviving that controversy.

It has given the country peace for above thirty years; how many years of disturbance will its abrogation bring? That is the statesman's question; and without assuming to be much of a statesman, I claim to be enough so to consider the consequences of breaking a settlement which pacified a continent. I remember the Missouri controversy, and how it destroyed all social feeling, and all capacity for beneficial legislation, and merged all political principle in an angry contest about Slavery—dividing the Union into two parts, and drawing up the two halves into opposite and confronting lines, like enemies on the field of battle. I do not wish to see such times again; and, therefore, am against reviving them by breaking up the settlement which quieted them.

The Missouri compromise of 1820 was the partitioning, between the free and slave States, of a great province, taking the character of a perpetual settlement, and classing with the two great compromises which gave us the ordinance of July 13, 1787, and the Federal Constitution, of September 17, of the same year. There are three Slavery compromises in our history, which connect themselves with the foundation and the preservation of this Union. First, the territorial partition ordinance of 1787, with its clause for the recovery of fugitive slaves; secondly, the contemporaneous constitutional recognition of Slavery in the States which chose to have it, with the fugitive slave recovery clause in the same instrument; thirdly, the Missouri partition line of 1820, with the same clause annexed for the recovery of fugitive slaves. All three of these compromises are part and parcel of the same policy; and neither of them could have been formed without the other, nor either of them without the fugitive slave recovery clause incorporated in it. The Anti-Slavery clause in the ordinance of 1787 could not have been adopted (as was proved by its three years' rejection) without the fugitive slave recovery clause added to it; the Constitution could not have been formed without its recognition of Slavery in the States which chose it, and the guarantee of the right to recover slaves fleeing into the free States; the Missouri controversy could not have been settled without a partition of Louisiana between free and slave soil; and that partition could not have been made without the addition of the same clause for the recovery of fugitive slaves. Thus, all three compromises are settlements of existing questions, and intended to be perpetual. They are all three of equal moral validity. The constitutional compromise is guarded by a higher obligation in consequence of its incorporation in that instrument; but it no way differs from the other two in the circumstances which induced it, the policy which guards it, or the consequences which would flow from its abrogation. A proposition to destroy the Slavery compromises in the Constitution would be an open proposition to break up the Union: the attempt to abrogate the compromises of 1787 and 1820 would be virtual attempts to destroy the harmony of the Union, and prepare it for dissolution, by destroying the confidence and affection in which it is founded.

The Missouri compromise of 1820 is a continuation of the ordinance of 1787—its extension to the since acquired territory west of the Mississippi, and no way differing from it either in principle or detail. The ordinance of 1787 divided the then territory of the United States about equally between the free and slave States; the Missouri compromise line did the same by the additional territory of the United States as it stood in 1820; and in both cases it was done by act of Congress, and was the settlement of a difficulty which was to last forever. I consider them both, with their fugitive slave recovery clauses, and the similar clause in the Constitution, as part and parcel of the same transaction—different articles in the same general settlement.

The Anti-Slavery clause in the ordinance of 1787 could not have been put in (as was proved by its three years' rejection) without the fugitive slave recovery clause added to it. The Constitution could not have been formed without the recognition of Slavery in the States which chose it, and the right of recovering slaves fleeing to the free States. The Missouri controversy could not have been settled except by the prohibition of Slavery in the upper half of the territory of Louisiana; and that prohibition could not have been obtained without the right to recover fugitive slaves from the part made free. Thus, the three measures are one, and the ordinance of 1787 father to the other two. It led to the adoption of the fugitive slave clause in the Constitution, and, we may say, to the formation of the Constitution itself, which could not have been adopted without that clause, and the recognition of slave property in which it was founded. This vital fact results of itself from the history of the case. In March, of the year 1784, the Virginia delegation in the then Congress of the Confederation, headed by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Monroe, conveyed the northwestern territory to the Thirteen United States. In the month of April ensuing, the organizing mind of Mr. Jefferson, always bent upon systems and administration, brought in an ordinance for the government of the territory so conveyed, with the Anti-Slavery clause as a part of it, to take effect in the year 1800, but without a clause for the recovery of fugitive slaves. For want of this provision the Anti-Slavery clause was opposed by the slaveholding States, and rejected, and the ordinance was passed without it. In July, of the year 1787, the ordinance was remodeled, the Anti-Slavery clause, with the fugitive slave recovery clause, as they now stand, were inserted in it; and in that shape the ordinance had the unanimous vote of every State present—eight in the whole—and an equal number of slave and free States present. Thus, it is clear that the Anti-Slavery clause in the ordinance of 1787 could not have passed without the fugitive slave recovery clause annexed. They were inseparable in their birth, and must be so in their life; and those who love one must accept the other.

This was done in the month of July, in the city of New York, where the Congress of the Confederation then sat. The National Convention was sitting at the same time in the city of Philadelphia, at work upon the Federal Constitution. The two bodies were in constant communication with each other, and some leading members (as Mr. Madison and General Hamilton) were members of each, and attending by turns in each. The Constitution was finished in September, and received the fugitive slave recovery clause immediately after its insertion in the ordinance. It was the work of the same hands, and at the same time, in both instruments; and it is well known that the Constitution could not have been formed without that clause. Thus the compromise clause in the ordinance is father to the compromise clause in the Constitution; and the Missouri compromise results from both; and all three stand before me as founded in the same circumstances, induced by the same considerations, and directed by the same policy—that of the peace, harmony and perpetuity of this Union. In point of moral obligation I consider them equal, and resulting from conditions which rendered them indispensable. Two of them have all the qualities of a compromise—those of the ordinance and of the Constitution. They are founded in agreement, in consent, in compact, and are as sacred and inviolable as human agreements can be. The third one—that of the Missouri Anti-Slavery line—was not made upon agreement. It was imposed by votes—by the South upon the North—resisted by the North at the time—acquiesced in afterwards; and by that acquiescence became a binding covenant between both parties; and the more so on the South because she imposed it. I repeat: it was an imposition, not a compact. The South divided, and took choice; and now it will not do to claim the other half on the ground of the original dissatisfaction of the other party. Brothers cannot divide an estate in that way—one make the division, and take choice, and afterwards claim the other half. The South has her half. She gave it away once—gave it to Spain; and the North helped her to get it back, even at the expense of war—without suspecting that she was strengthening the South to enable it to take the other half. But this attempt does not come from the South, and finds resistance there.

This brings us to the question of repeal, or abrogation of these compromises. The one in the Constitution cannot be got rid of without an amendment to that instrument; and is, therefore, beyond the reach of Congress. The other two, being in the form of statutes, are subjects of legislation, and legally repealable by Congress. Efforts were made to impair one, that of 1787, some fifty years ago. An effort is now made to repeal the other; and the history and fate of the first attempt may be advantageous in the consideration of the second. It was in the year 1803. The then Territory of Indiana had been slave territory under the French Government, and continued so under the American until 1787. It extended to the Mississippi, and contained many slaves. Vincennes, Cahokia, Prairie de Rocher, Kaskaskia, were all slaveholding towns. The inhabitants were attached to that property, and wished to retain it, at least temporarily; and also to invite a slaveholding emigration, until an increase of population should afford an adequate supply of free labour; and they petitioned Congress accordingly. The petition came from a convention of the people, presided over by Governor Harrison, and only asked for the suspension of the Anti-Slavery part of the ordinance for ten years, and limited in its application to their own territory. The petition was referred to a select committee of the House; Mr. Randolph was chairman; and received its answer in a report, in these words:

"That the rapid population of the State of Ohio sufficiently evinces, in the opinion of your committee, that the labour of slaves is not necessary to promote the growth and settlement of colonies in that region. That this labour, demonstrably the dearest of any, can only be employed to advantage in the cultivation of products more valuable than any known in that quarter of the United States; that the committee deem it highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the northwestern country, and to give strength and security to that extensive frontier. In the salutary operation of this sagacious and benevolent restraint, it is believed that the inhabitants of Indiana will, at no very distant day, find ample remuneration for a temporary privation of labour and emigration."

This was the answer of the select committee; and it became the answer of the House—of this House just fifty years ago—when the South was about as ably represented here as it ever has been since, and when its relative strength was greater than it has ever been since. The answer is a peremptory refusal to yield to the petition of the people of Indiana, even for a ten years' local suspension of this Anti-Slavery clause. "Highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair that provision." Yes, to impair! that is the word; and it is a refusal to weaken or lessen, in the smallest degree, an act which the committee calls a "benevolent and sagacious act;" and which they recommend to maintain unimpaired, because it is "calculated to increase the happiness and prosperity of the northwest, and to give strength and security to its frontier." That Congress, and that without division between North and South, would not impair an act of so much future good to posterity, not even upon the mistaken application of a few present inhabitants.

But this was not the end of the petitions. The people of Indiana were not satisfied with one repulse. They returned to the charge; and four times more, in the course of as many years, renewed their application for the ten years' suspension of the ordinance.

It was rejected each time, and once in the Senate, where the North Carolina Senator [Mr. Jesse Franklin] was chairman of the committee which made this report against it. Five times, in as many years, rejected by Congress; and the rejection the more emphatic in some instances because it was the reversal by the House of a favourable report from a committee. And now what inhabitant of Indiana does not rejoice at the deliverance which the firmness of Congress then gave them, in spite of the request of its inhabitants fifty years ago?

Thus, five times in the beginning of this century—five different times, and without any distinction between northern and southern members—did Congress refuse to "impair" the Slavery compromise of 1787, notwithstanding five times asked for by the people of the Territory. Oh, squatter sovereignty! where were you then? It was a case for you to have shown your head—to have arisen in your might—and established your supremacy forever. It was a case of a convention of the sovereigns themselves; and neither this convention nor the Congress had a dream of their sovereignty. The convention petitioned Congress as a ward does its guardian, or children under age would petition their father, and Congress answered like a good guardian, or a good father, that it would not give them an evil, although they begged for it. Benighted times these, and infinitely behind the present age. The mare's nest had not then been found in which has been laid the marvellous egg out of which has been hatched the nondescript fowl, yclept "squatter sovereignty." The illustrious principle of non-intervention had not then been invented. The ignoramuses of that day had never heard of it, though now to be learned in every horn-book; and, I believe, nowhere else but in the horn-books.

Five times in the beginning of this century did Congress refuse to impair the Slavery compromise of '87: and now, in the middle of the century, and after thirty years of peace under the Missouri compromise—the offspring and continuation of that of '87—we are called upon, not merely to impair, for a season, but to destroy forever, a far greater compromise—extending to far more territory—and growing out of necessities far more pressing. And how called upon? Not by the inhabitants—not by any one human being living or expecting to live on the territory to be affected—but upon a motion in Congress—a silent, secret, limping, halting, creeping, squinting, impish motion—conceived in the dark—midwifed in a committee room, and sprung upon Congress and the country in the style in which Guy Fawkes intended to blow up the Parliament house, with his five hundred barrels of gunpowder, hid in the cellar under the wood.

My answer to such a motion is to be found in the whole volume of my political life. I have stood upon the Missouri compromise for above thirty years; and mean to stand upon it to the end of my life; and in doing so shall act, not only according to my own cherished convictions of duty, but according to the often-declared convictions of the General Assembly of my State. The inviolability of that compromise line has often been declared by that General Assembly; and as late as 1847, in these words:

"Resolved, That the peace, permanency and welfare of our national Union depend upon a strict adherence to the letter and spirit of the eighth section of the act of Congress of the United States, entitled '*An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit Slavery in certain territories*,' approved March 6, 1820,"

with an instruction to the Senators, and a request to the Representatives in Congress, to vote accordingly.

"The peace, permanency and welfare of the Union depend upon a strict adherence to the Missouri compromise of 1820." So resolved the General Assembly of Missouri as late as 1847. I believed the Assembly was right then: I believe it now: and so believing, shall "adhere" to the compromise now, as then, "in spirit and in letter."

I should oppose any movement to impair that compromise, made in an open, direct, manly manner: much more shall I oppose it if made in a covert, indirect, and unmanly way. The bill or bills before us undertake to accomplish their object without professing it—upon reasons which are contradictory and unfounded—in terms which are ambiguous and inconsistent—and by throwing on others the responsibility of its own act. It professes not to interfere with the sovereign right of the people to legislate for themselves; and the very first line of this solemn profession throws upon them a horse-load of law, which they have no right to refuse, or time to read, or money to purchase, or ability to understand. It throws upon them all the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable; and that comprehends all that are not specially made for other places: also, it gives them the Constitution of the United States, but without the privilege of voting at Presidential or Congressional elections, or of making their own judiciary. This is non-interference with a vengeance. A community to be buried under a mountain of strange law, and covered with a constitution under which they are not to have one single political right. Why this circumlocution? this extension of a mountain of irrelevant law, with the exception of the only one relevant and applicable? Sir, it is the crooked, insidious, and pusillanimous way of effecting the repeal of the Missouri compromise line. It includes all law for the sake of leaving out one law; and effects a repeal by an omission, and legislates by an exception. It is a new way of repealing a law, and a bungling attempt to smuggle Slavery into the Territory, and all the country out to the Canada line and up the Rocky Mountains. The crooked line of this smuggling process is this: "abolish the compromise line, and extend the Constitution over the country: the Constitution recognises Slavery: therefore, Slavery is established as soon as the line is abolished, and the Constitution extended: and being put there by the Constitution, it cannot be legislated out." This is the English of this smuggling process; and certainly nothing more unworthy of legislation—more derogatory to a legislative body—was ever attempted to be made into law. Sir, the Constitution was not made for Territories, but for States. Its provisions are all applicable to States, and cannot be put in operation in Territories. They cannot vote for President, or Vice-President, or members of Congress, nor elect their own officers, or prescribe the qualifications of voters, or administer their own laws by their own judges, sheriffs, and attorneys; and the clause extending the Constitution to them is a cheat and an illusion, and a trick to smuggle Slavery into the Territory. Nor is it intended that they shall have any legislative right under the Constitution, even in relation to Slavery. They may admit it because it is to be there by the Constitution: they cannot exclude it because the Constitution puts it there. That is the argument; and it is a juggle worthy of the trick of one egg under three hats at the same time—and under neither at any time. Besides, the Constitution is an organic, not an administrative, act. It is a code of principles, not of laws. Not a clause in it can be executed except by virtue of a law made under it—not even the clause for recovering fugitive slaves.

But I am not done yet with the beauties of this mode of repealing a law by an exception. There is a further consequence to be detected in it. The Missouri compromise consists of two distinct parts: first, an abolition of Slavery in all the ancient Louisiana north and west of Missouri; secondly, a provision for the recovery of fugitive slaves in the territory made free. By the omitted extension of this section, both these parts are repealed. A tract of country larger than the old thirteen Atlantic States, and bordering a thousand miles on the British dominions, is made an asylum for fugitive slaves. There will be no law to recover a slave from all that vast region. The constitutional provision is limited to States: the north-west territory; the second part of the Missouri compromise extended this right to all the territory north and west of Missouri; and that being repealed, that right of recovery is lost. I object to this on the part of the State of Missouri—the State to be most injured by converting all the territory north and west of her, quite out to the British line, into an asylum for runaway slaves. The blunder cannot be corrected (at least in the opinion of those who deny the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on Slavery in the Territories) by an act of Congress.

Then comes the reason for excepting the Missouri compromise from the extension which is given to a mass of laws which are not there, and denied to itself which is there. If the reason had been because it was already there, it would have been a logical and comprehensible reason; but that is not the cause assigned; and those which are assigned are actually numerous and curious, and worthy of examination. First, because it was superseded by certain acts of 1850; next, that it is inconsistent with those acts; then that is inoperative; and finally, that it never was there, being dead in its birth under the Constitution, and void from the beginning.

Let us look into these reasons, *seriatim*, as the lawyers say: and first of supersession. It is said that the measures of 1850 superseded this compromise of 1820. If so, why treat it now as still existing, and therefore to be repealed by an exception in order to get rid of it? If it was repealed in 1850, why do it over again in 1854? Why kill the dead? But it was not superseded; but acknowledged and confirmed by every speaker in 1850 that referred to the subject, and by every act that mentioned it. This being matter of fact, and proven by all sorts of testimony—parole, written, and record—it had to be given up (though a test of political orthodoxy as long as it stood) and something else put in its place. Thereupon supersession was itself superseded by "inconsistent." Out of the frying-pan into the fire! Inconsistent signifies inability to stand together—two things which cannot stand together—from *con* and *sisto*. Now, what is the fact with respect to the compromises of 1820 and 1850? Can they not stand together? And if not, why knock the one down that is already down? It is now four years since this inability to stand together took effect; and how do the two sets of measures make out together at the end of this time? Perfectly well. They are both on their feet—standing bolt upright—and will stand so forever, unless Congress knocks either the one or the other of them down. This is fact, known to everybody, and admitted by the bill itself; for if the first is inconsistent with the second, and unable to stand, why all this trouble to put it down? Why trip up the heels of the man already flat on his back on the ground? Then comes another reason—that this compromise of 1820 is inoperative and void. If so, those who are against its operation should be content. It is in the very condition they wish it—useless, powerless, inactive, dead—and no bar to the progress of Slavery to the North. Void is vacant, empty, nothing of it. Now, if the line of 36 deg. 30 min. is inoperative and void, it is in the condition of a fence pulled down, and the rails carried away, and the field left open for the stock to enter. But the fence is not pulled down yet. The line is not yet inoperative and void. It is an existing substantive line, alive and operating; and operating effectually to bar the progress of Slavery to the North; and will so continue to operate until Congress shall stop its operation. Then comes the final reason, that there never was any such line in the world—that it was unconstitutional and void—that it had no existence from the beginning; and that it must not be repealed by a direct act, for that would be to acknowledge its previous existence, and to nullify the Constitutional argument; and, what is more terrible, involve the authors of the doctrine in an inconsistency of their own; and thereby make them, themselves, inoperative and void. And this is the analysis of the reasons for the Nebraska bill—that part of it which is to get rid of the compromise of 1820: untrue, contradictory, suicidal, and preposterous. And why such a farrago of nullities, incongruities, and inconsistencies? Purely and simply to throw upon others—upon the Congress of 1850 and the innocent Constitution—the blame of what the bill itself is doing; the blame of destroying the compromise of 1820; and with it, destroying all confidence between the North and the South, and arraying one half the Union against the other in deadly hostility. It is to be able to throw blame upon the innocent that this farrago is served up to us.

And what is all this hotch-potch for? It is to establish a principle, they say—the principle of non-intervention—of a squatter sovereignty. Sir, there is no such principle. The territories are the children of the States. They are minors under twenty-one years of age; and it is the business of the States, through their delegations in Congress, to take care of these minors until they are of age—until they are ripe for State Government—then give them that government, and admit them to an equality with their fathers. That is the law, and the sense of the case; and has been so acknowledged since the first ordinance in 1784, by all authorities, Federal and State, legislative, judicial, and executive. The States in Congress are the guardians of the Territories, and are bound to exercise the guardianship; and cannot abdicate it without a breach of trust and a dereliction of duty. Territorial sovereignty is a monstrosity, born of timidity and ambition, hatched into existence in the hot incubation of a presidential canvass, and revolting to the beholders when first presented. Well do I remember that day when it was first shown in the Senate. Mark Antony did not better remember the day when Cæsar first put on that mantle through which he was afterward pierced with three-and-twenty "envious stabs." It was in the Senate in 1848, and was received as nonsense—as the essence of nonsense—as the quintessence of nonsense—as the five-times distilled essence of political nonsensicality. Why, sir, the Territory itself is the property of the States, and they do what they please with it—permit it to be settled or not, as they please; cut it up by lines, as they please; sell it, or give it away, as they please; chase white people from it, as they please. After this farrago—this *olla-podrida*—comes a little stump speech, injected into the belly of the bill, and which must have a prodigious effect when recited in the prairies, and out towards the frontiers and up towards the head of the creeks. I will read it, and I hope without fatiguing the House; for it is both brief and beautiful, and runs thus:

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom: but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

This is the speech, and a pretty little thing itself, and very proper to be spoken from a stump in the prairie. It has intent, and a true intent; which is neither to legislate Slavery into or out of any State or Territory. Then why legislate at all? Why all this disturbance if no effect is produced, and things to remain just as they were? Let well enough alone, was the old doctrine; to make well enough still better, is the doctrine of progress; and that in spite of the Italian epitaph, which says: "I was well, and would be better; took physic, and here I am." But the States must be greatly delighted at the politeness and forbearance of this bill. It puts States and Territories upon precisely equality with respect to the power of Congress over them. Congress does not mean to put Slavery in or out of any State or Territory. To all that polite abnegation, I have to say that, in respect of the States, it is the supererogation of modesty and humility, as Congress happens to have no power to put Slavery in them, or out of them; and in respect of the Territories, it is an abdication of a constitutional power and duty; it being the right of Congress to legislate upon Slavery in the Territories, and its duty to do so when there is occasion for it—as in 1787 and 1820.

I object to this shilly-shally—willy-won't-don't-can't-ity—style of legislation. It is not legislative. It is not parliamentary. It is not manly. It is not womanly. No woman would talk that way. No shilly-shally in a woman. Nothing of the female gender was ever born young enough, or lived long enough, to get befogged in such a quandary as this. It is one thing or the other with them; and what they say they stick to. No breaking bargains with them. But the end of this stump speech is the best of the whole. Different from good milk, in which the cream rises to the top, it here settles to the bottom, and is in these words:

"Leave it to the people thereof, that is to say, of the States and of the Territories, to regulate Slavery for themselves as they please, only subject to the Constitution of the United States."

Certainly this is a new subjection for the States. Heretofore they have been free to regulate Slavery for themselves—admit it, or reject it; and that not by virtue of any grant of power in the Constitution, but by virtue of an unsurrendered part of their old sovereignty. It is also new of the Territories. Heretofore they have been held to be wards of Congress and entitled to nothing under the Constitution but that which Congress extended to them. But this clause is not accidentally here; it is to keep up the dogma of the Constitution in Territories; but only there in relation to Slavery, and for its admission—not rejection.

Three dogmas now afflict the land; *videlicet*: squatter sovereignty, non-intervention, and no power in Congress to legislate upon Slavery in Territories. And this bill asserts the whole three, and beautifully illustrates the whole three, by knocking each one on the head with the other, and trampling each under foot in its turn. Sir the bill does deny squatter sovereignty, and does intervene, and it does legislate upon Slavery in Territories; and for the proof of that, see the bill; and see it, as the lawyers say, *passim*; that is to say, here, and there, and everywhere. It is a bill of assumptions and contradictions—assuming what is unfounded, and contradicting what it assumes—and balancing every affirmation by a negation. It is a see-saw bill; but not the innocent see-saw which children play on a plank stuck through a fence; but the up and down game of politicians, played at the expense of the peace and harmony of the Union, and to the sacrifice of all business in Congress. It is an amphibological bill, stuffed with monstrosities, hobbled with contradictions, and Badgered with a proviso.

Amphibology is a cause for the rejection of bills, not only by Congress, but by the President when carried to him for his approval. General Jackson rejected one for that cause, and it was less amphibological than this: it was the last night of the last day of his last Administration, and a quarter before midnight. Congress had sent him a bill to repeal the specie circular, and to inaugurate the paper money of a thousand local banks as the currency of the Federal Government. It was an object not to be avowed, not to be done in any direct or palpable manner. Paraphrases, circumlocution, ambidexterity, and ambiguity, were necessary to cover up the design; and it was piled on until it was unintelligible. The President read it, and could make nothing of it; he sent to his Attorney General, who was equally puzzled. He then returned it, with a message to the Senate, refusing to sign the bill for amphibology. We should reject this bill for the same cause, if for nothing else. Hard is the fate of party fealty. It has to keep up with the everchanging measure. Often have these bills changed; and under every phrase they had to be received as a test of orthodoxy; and have more changes to undergo yet; and to continue to be a test under all mutations.

And now, what is the object of this movement, which so disturbs Congress and the country? What does it propose to accomplish? To settle a principle, is the answer—the principle of non-intervention and the right of the people of the Territory to decide the question of Slavery for themselves. Sir, there is no such principle. The Territories are the children of the States. They are minors, under age, and it is the business of the States, through their delegations in Congress, to take care of them until they are of age—until they are ripe for State government; then to give them that government, and admit them to an equality with their fathers. That is law, and has been so admitted since the first ordinance, in 1784. The States in Congress are the guardians of the Territories, and are bound to exercise that guardianship; and cannot abdicate it without a breach of trust and a dereliction of duty. Why, sir, the territory itself is the property of the States, and they do with it what they please—permit it to be settled or not, as they please; cut it up by lines, as they please; chase white people from it, as they please. This has been always the case. There is a proclamation now extant of the old Congress of the Confederation, describing the first settlers in the Northwest Territory as "disorderly persons," and ordering them to be driven off by the military. I remember many such military expulsions in the early settlement of the western country, often executed with severity; burning houses, cutting up corn, destroying fences, and driving off the people at the point of the bayonet, under the edge of the sabre. As late as 1835-'36, and after the extinction of the Indian title to the Platte country in Missouri, similar orders were given to the then colonel of dragoons commanding on that frontier, the now Senator in Congress, Henry Dodge, to expel the people from that purchase; orders which he executed in gentleness and mercy, going alone, explaining his business, and requiring them to go away; which they did, like good and orderly people; and when he was gone, came back like sensible and industrious people, and secured their pre-emptions. Not only settled, but organized territory, has been so treated by the Federal Government, and worse; the people driven off and their homes given away. This happened in Arkansas in 1828, when twelve thousand square miles of her organized territory was given to the Cherokees, and the people driven away. Why, sir, this very line of 36 deg. 30 min., with all the territory on one side of it, and two degrees on the other side, were given away to the King of Spain. This has been the seventy years' practice of the Government—to treat the Territories as property, and the people as uninvited guests, to be entertained, or turned out, as the owner of the House chooses. Fine sovereigns these! chased off by the military, and their homes given to the Indians or Spaniards. The whole idea of this sovereignty is a novelty, scouted from Congress when it first appeared in the Senate, contradicted by the Constitution, and the whole action of the Government, in all time; and contradicted by the bill itself, which is to secure it. The provisions of the bill are a burlesque upon sovereignty. It gives to the people, instead of receiving from them, an organic act. And what an organic act! One in which they are denied every attribute of sovereignty. Denied freedom of elections; denied freedom of voting; denied choice of their own laws; denied the right of fixing the qualifications of voters; subjected to a foreign supervision; and controllable by the Federal Government, which they have had no hand in electing; and only allowed to admit, and not to reject, Slavery. Their sovereignty only extends to the subject of Slavery, and only to one side of that—the admitting side; the other half of the power being held to be denied by the Constitution which is extended over them, and which (according to the reading of the supporters of this bill) forbids any law to be made which will prevent any citizen from going there with his slaves. This is a squatter sovereignty, non-intervention, and no power to legislate in Territories upon Slavery. And this is called a principle—the principle of non-intervention—letting the people alone to settle the question of Slavery for themselves. How settle it? That can only be done in an organic act; and they have no such act, nor can have one till they make a Constitution for a State government. All the rest is legislation, which settles nothing, and produces contention at every election. Sir, this principle of non-intervention is but the principle of contention—a bone given to the people to quarrel and fight over at every election, and at every meeting of their Legislature, until they become a State government. Then, and then only, can they settle the question.

For seventy years—since the year 1784, when the organizing mind of Jefferson drew the first territorial ordinance—we had a uniform method of providing for the government of the Territories, all founded upon the clause in the Constitution which authorizes Congress to dispose of, and make rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States. This mode of government has consisted of three grades, all founded in the right of Congress to govern them. First grade: a Governor and Judges, appointed by the United States, to adopt laws from other States, to be in force until disapproved by Congress. Second grade: a Territorial Legislature, when the inhabitants shall amount to five thousand men above the age of twenty-one, composed of a council partly appointed by the United States, and a House of Representatives elected by the people, at the rate of one representative for every five hundred voters, its legislation subject to the approval of Congress. Third grade: entrance on the State Government, in full equality with the other States. This is the way these Territories have been governed for seventy years; and I am for adhering to it.

And now what is the excuse for all this disturbance of the country; this breaking up of ancient compromises; arraying one half of the Union against the other, and destroying the temper and business of Congress? What is the excuse for all this turmoil and mischief? We are told it is to keep the question of Slavery out of Congress! To keep Slavery out of Congress! Great God! It was out of Congress! completely, entirely, and forever out of Congress, unless Congress dragged it in by breaking down the sacred laws which settled it. The question was settled, and done with. There was not an inch square of territory in the Union on which it could be raised without a breach of a compromise. The ordinance of '89 settled it in all the remaining part of the Northwest Territory beyond Wisconsin: the compromise line of 36 deg 30 min. settled it in all country north and west of Missouri to the British line, and up to the Rocky Mountains: the organic act of Oregon, made by the people, and sanctioned by Congress, settled it in all that region: the acts for the government of Utah and New Mexico settled it in those two Territories: the compact with Texas, determining the number of slave States to be formed out of that State, settled it there: and California settled it for herself. Now, where was there an inch square of Territory within the United States on which the question could be raised? Nowhere! Not an inch! The question was settled everywhere, not merely by law, but by fact. The work was done, and there was no way to get at the question but by undoing the work! No way for Congress to get the question in, for the purpose of keeping it out, but to break down compromises which kept it out.

What advantage do the slave States expect from this bill? Certainly they expect the extension of slave power, and slave population. The question of Slavery in these Territories, if thrown open to territorial action, will be a question of numbers—a question of the majority for or against Slavery and what chance would the slaveholder have in such a contest? No chance at all. The slave emigrants will be outnumbered, and compelled to play a most unequal game, not only in point of numbers, but also in point of stakes. The slaveholder stakes his property: and has to run it off, or lose it, if outvoted at the polls. I see nothing which slaveholders are to gain under this bill—nothing but an unequal and vexatious contest, in which they are to be losers. I deprecate such a contest, and did my part to keep it out of the State of Missouri when her Constitution was formed. I was not a member of the convention, but was a chief promoter of the clause which forbid the Legislature to emancipate slaves without the consent of their owners. I promoted that clause for the sake of peace—for the sake of keeping the Slavery question out of our elections and legislation—for the sake of preventing perpetual strife among the people. What I did for Missouri, I would do for the Territories; and if it was an open question would vote one way or the other to settle it; but it is not an open question! and cannot be opened without a breach of faith, and the destruction of the peace of the country.

Sir, the question has been decided. The free States are against this bill; and it is an ill return for their past generous conduct to endeavour to force it upon them. They have been not only just, but magnanimous, to the slave States. What was the condition of the slave States thirty years ago in relation to the use of the soil within their limits? Debarred of a great part of it use: an Indian population covering more

these means. The same votes gave us the Platte country; seven fine counties added to the State! and that by altering the compromise line to include it, and actually converting that fine region from free soil to slave soil. Northern votes enabled it to be done: Northern votes altered above an hundred miles of the compromise line for our benefit, upon our request; and I will never be ungrateful to the North for it, nor requite it by a breach of the line to their prejudice. And how did we obtain the Northern votes which were necessary for all these measures—the appropriations and treaties for all these Indian removals, and for that alteration of the compromise line which gave us the beautiful Platte country? How did the Missouri delegation of the day—the most amiable and talented Dr. Linn and myself, in the Senate, and General Ashley in the House—how did we obtain that great boon for our State? Did we get these votes by belching abolitionism against the North? No! no! we got them by appealing to the justice, and the fraternal feelings of our Northern brethren, and to which we never appealed once in vain—who, in the last hard trial to get the Cherokees out of Georgia, gave us fourteen affirmative votes to balance seven negatives from the South, and save the treaty by one vote. And I, who was part of all these transactions, accustomed to solicit Northern votes, and express thanks for them, will not now return them evil for good by attempting to deprive them of their share of a compromise which we imposed upon them.

It is now four months since this movement for the abrogation of the Missouri compromise commenced in this Congress. It began without a memorial, without a petition, without a request, from a human being. It has laboured long and hard in these Halls, and to this hour there is not a petition for it from the class of States for whose benefit the movement professes to have been made!—not a word in its favour from the smallest public meeting or private assemblage of any State. This is the response of the South to this boon tendered to it by Northern members under a Northern President. It is the response of silence—more emphatic than words—and worthy of especial note in this debate. It argues well for the harmony of the Union, and goes to show (what in fact has been often seen) that the troubles of the country come from uneasy politicians—its safety from the tranquil masses.

[NOTE.—Mr. Benton's hour expired before his speech was finished, and in the struggle to get the floor Mr. Wentworth, of Ill., succeeded in catching the eye of the Speaker. He immediately proposed to yield so much of his hour as would suffice Mr. Benton, in which to finish his speech. A desperate attempt was made to prevent this by the friends of the Nebraska Bill, and an excited debate ensued on various points of order. By the help of a motion for an amendment Mr. Wentworth was at last successful in yielding out of his time all that Mr. Benton needed. The effect of the speech, and the fear it excited, may be estimated by this attempt to suppress a portion of it. The courtesy of granting the time needed, over and above the hour accorded by the rules, was never before refused to any member.]

Selections.

NORTH AND SOUTH.

THE articles we have recently published on the relative power of the northern and southern divisions of the United States, on the cost of the Union to the North, and on the free use of the national resources to extend the area of Slavery, while nothing is suffered to be done to improve the rivers and harbours of the Free States, are naturally exciting a deep attention in every quarter. The journals of all parties and all sections make them the occasion for such comments as suit their varied predilections. We receive these manifestations as evidence that there was need of the exposition we have given of these remarkable facts. Indeed, it was high time to respond to the insolent and foolish assertions so constantly put forth by the organs of the slave-driving power, that the North owes all her mighty growth and prosperity not to her own manly industry and enterprise but to profits made upon southern trade and derived from southern patronage. That absurd notion we have exploded; we have also shown, to some extent at least, what a ridiculous menace is that of disunion, wherewith the South has so long and so often frightened the Free States into submission to her most intolerable demands, and on this subject we now propose to make a few additional observations.

We beg our readers to compare with us the present relative position of northern and southern States and cities. Sixty years since, Virginia stood at the head of the Union, with ten representatives in Congress, while this State had only six. Where stand they now? New-York has thirty-three and Virginia thirteen. Sixty years since, South Carolina had five representatives, while Ohio had scarcely a white inhabitant; now the former has still her old number of five, while the latter has twenty-one. In that time Massachusetts has grown from eight to eleven; Pennsylvania from eight to twenty-five; and even little New-Jersey which then had only four, now balances the State which furnished the great aristocracy of the land in its Pinckneys, Rutledges, Cheveses and Gadsdens. At that time, this City, Norfolk and Charleston, might fairly have disputed the chances of commercial greatness that hung upon the future; but where stand they now? At the last census, Charleston had 42,800 inhabitants, having increased in ten years precisely 1,669. Norfolk had 14,320, or 3,400 more than she had in 1840, while New-York and Brooklyn had risen to more than 600,000.

We are told, however, that this is all due to the actions of the Federal Government; that "the immense commercial resources of the South are among the most startling and certain resources in all emergencies;" that "if there was no tariff of any kind, and absolute free trade, the southern seaports would in a quarter of a century surpass the northern ones, not only in imports and exports, but also in population and the arts"—and that the way to bring about this reign of free trade and prosperity is to tax all merchandise imported from northern parts, or in northern ships, while admitting free all those imported from Europe or in southern vessels. Incredible as it may seem to our readers, such is the mode we find advocated in the *Richmond Enquirer* as that required for the establishment of perfect free trade.

If, however, the prosperity of New-York, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania, which are manufacturing States, has really been due to the tariff, and if protection is injurious to agricultural communities, how, we would ask, can we account for the growth of Indiana and Illinois, which are not manufacturing States? Agreeably to the Slavery theory, they should suffer equally with South Carolina and Virginia; and yet we find them growing to almost a million each of population; while Arkansas, almost as old, has less than 200,000, although she has offered, in *free gift*, the choice of all her lands that have been sold for taxes. Their railroads count by thousands of miles, while Arkansas has, we believe, the first mile of road yet to make. Southern men can scarcely charge the new State of Wisconsin with protection, and yet, she bids fair to have a thousand miles of rail before Texas shall have completed fifty or sixty miles of her first road. Telegraphs abound through the western and northwestern States, and Ohio contains a perfect network of them: while Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia present to view little more than a single line, and even that maintained almost exclusively by the transmission of intelligence *across* them from northern cities to New-Orleans. Look where we may, we find the same result; throughout the North there is the activity of freedom and life, while throughout the South there is the palsy of Slavery and death.

The prosperity of the North-west is, however, as we are told, also due to the partiality of the Federal Government, the almost exclusive management of which has been so generally in Southern hands. What Massachusetts and this State gain from the tariff is made up to the newer States by donations out of the common treasury of lands. On this head we quote from the *Richmond Whig*:

"Illinois is indebted for these two thousand miles of railroad to the bounty of the Federal Government, a bounty indulged at the expense of the Southern States, whose feebleness and decay are sneered at. Every foot of these roads has been made by appropriations of public lands. Not a cent has come out of the pockets of the people. And railroads are not the only favours bestowed upon the hireling States. Immense contributions have been made to them all, for schools and colleges. We dare say, if the same liberal measure had been dealt out to the slaveholding States; if their territory had been permeated by canals and railroads, and schools established in every neighbourhood, at the expense of the northern States, we, too, might boast of our prosperity. It would not be going too far to say that Illinois herself, if, in addition to the millions she has received from the Federal Treasury, had had the benefit of slave labour, might have been still more prosperous."

In reply to this a cotemporary furnishes the following abstract of a report from the Department of the Interior, made a few weeks since, showing the donations of land to six Western free States and six slave States, to which we ask the attention of our readers:

	Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin.	Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Florida.
School Lands....	acres 5,273,749	acres 5,520,504
Universities.....	253,360	 207,366
Seats of Government..	28,560	 22,300
Salines.....	261,045	 161,230
Internal Improvement.	1,569,449	 2,600,000
Roads.....	251,355	....
Canals and Rivers....	4,996,873	 400,000
Railroads.....	2,595,053	 5,788,098
Swamp Lands.....	11,265,333	 24,533,020
Individuals & Comp's.	60,981	 17,839
Military Services.....	20,167,763	 5,716,974
Total.....	46,723,391	45,167,325

The appropriations here appear to be equal, but when we come to deduct the lands selected by individuals who had their choice to go into southern or northern States, we find the southern grants for public purposes to be forty millions against twenty-five millions of northern ones. Men do not to any extent go voluntarily into the slave States, but vast numbers leave those States to settle in the free ones, as is shown in the fact that the late census exhibits more than six hundred thousand people from the former settled in the latter, while the latter exhibit but 208,000 persons from the former; and if we deduct from them the number settled in the three States nearest the free ones,—Delaware, Maryland, and Missouri, which as we have shown, in the event of dissolution, must belong to the North, we shall find but 123,000 remaining, or about one to five. Freedom is attractive and Slavery is repulsive. Men of activity and intelligence seek the free States, leaving the old slave States to the occupation of men whose dreams are of those long-passed days, when Virginia was the "Ancient Dominion," and who console themselves for present insignificance by paragraphs of which the following, taken from the *Richmond Examiner*, is a specimen:

"*Virginia, in this confederacy, is the impersonation of the well-born, well-educated, well-bred aristocrat.* She looks down from her elevated pedestal upon her *pervenu*, ignorant, mendacious Yankee vilifiers, as coldly and calmly as a marble statue. Occasionally, in Congress, or in the nominating conventions of the Democratic party, she condescends when her interests demand it, to recognise the existence of her adversaries at the very moment when she crushes them; but she does it without anger, and with no more hatred of them than a gardener feels toward the insects which he finds it necessary occasionally to destroy."

The aristocracy do not work. The democracy do; and hence it is that the six free and six slave States, having received from the treasury, for all purposes, an equal quantity of land, presented to view, at the date of the last census, the following comparison between the railroads completed and in progress:

"The hireling States" of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin.		The aristocratic States of Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Florida.	
Completed.	*In progress.*	*Completed.*	*In progress.*
2,913	4,955	417	2,318

A similar comparison, now made out, would present results still more striking, but even this should be sufficient to satisfy our readers; first, that the trade offered by the South to the North as the price of submission to the dictates and extension of Slavery, cannot be otherwise than insignificant when compared with their own trade; and second, that the enormous difference existing is not due to any action of the Federal Government, in the management of which the North has almost uniformly been denied the slightest control.

We are told, however, that the North must submit to the South if it would not return to "the original poverty and weakness" that must follow a dissolution of the Union. Let us look at this proposition. At the North, everybody works. At the South, the *property* only works. Freemen there think work disgraceful and do little of it. At the North, there is a desire to increase the value of labour and to free the labourer. At the South, there is a universal desire to extend the area of Slavery, and to keep the labourer in a state of Slavery, even when he has "blue eyes and brown hair, and might readily pass for white." At the North, protection tends to diversify the employment of labour, to increase the demand for it, and to increase its reward, while public opinion tends toward the gratuitous distribution of public land among the actual settlers of it, and the establishment of a squatter sovereignty. At the South, the *Richmond Enquirer*, the organ of the Virginia aristocracy above described, tells its readers that it has little hope of the defeat of the Homestead bill. "The conservatism of the Senate," as it continues,

"will hardly reject so plausible an appeal to popular passion. King Caucus is no longer monarch; the more soft, subtle and persuasive Prince of Demagoguism now reigns supreme in the province of politics. It is barely possible that the measure may be arrested by executive veto."

Northern policy is attractive of immigration, because it looks thus to the elevation of the labourer. Immigration is always largest when mills and furnaces are being built, and where there is the greatest demand for labour, and it always declines as mills are closed and furnaces are permitted to go out of blast. Under the tariff of 1828, immigration trembled, and by 1834 it had reached 65,000; after which it remained nearly stationary until the tariff of 1842 came fully into operation, when it commenced to increase with such rapidity that in 1847 it had already almost reached a quarter of a million, the point it would have touched ten years sooner had the people of the North been permitted to direct the operations of the Government in accordance with the views of Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Jackson—and long before the present time it would have reached a million.

To this, however, "the impersonation of the well-born, well-educated, and well-bred aristocrat" is opposed. It dislikes "squatter sovereignty," and holds in great contempt the people of "the hireling States," who sell their own labour, while looking with great complacency upon the operations of its own people engaged in feeding corn to men, women, and children, to be sold in Louisiana and Texas, there to swell "the immense commercial resources of the South," which constitute, as we are assured in the *Enquirer*, "the basis of the commerce of the Union." It would, therefore, if it could, put a stop to the voluntary immigration of free men, while it would gladly re-open the African slave trade, which now seems to be regarded at the South as the real measure of civilization.

North of Mason and Dixon's line, of the Ohio, and of 36 deg. 30 min., we have land sufficient for hundreds of millions of inhabitants. We need population and the surest way to bring it is to afford the people of Europe reason for believing that by coming here they will be enabled to earn higher wages than they can obtain at home, and enjoy, in greater perfection, the advantages of freedom. Every person that comes here is worth *to the community* all he cost to raise, and the average cost of the men, women and children we import has certainly not been less than $1,000. Were these people black, and did they come from Africa to southern ports, they would be *property*, and *the community* would be regarded as being richer by at least $500 a head because of their importation. If so there, then why not so here? To the community it matters not who is the owner of property, provided it exists and is owned among themselves. The negro is the property of another, but the free immigrant is his own property, and hence more valuable than the negro; and every such person constitutes an addition to the wealth of the community of at least $1,000. Northern policy, even as it is now carried out, attracts nearly 400,000 such persons annually, few or none of whom would come under an entirely southern policy, and to this vast immigration is, to a great extent, due the fact that in a single western State, Illinois, the increase in the value of property in the year 1853, over that of 1852, was $58,000,000, or more than five times as much as the annual value of that portion of our trade with the South which is dependent on its refraining from executing the project of dissolution.

Had the northern policy been fully carried out, we should now be importing people at double our present rate, and every man so imported would be adding to the value of southern products, by consuming thrice and perhaps five times as much cotton and sugar as he consumed at home. At the same time they would be adding to the value of northern land and labour to the extent of at least the sum we have named, or an amount of four hundred millions of dollars, being more than twenty dollars per head to the present population of the States we have classified as belonging to the North. Adding this quantity to those already obtained, we are disposed to place the loss of the North, from the continuance of the Union, at about forty dollars per head; while the gain therefrom does not exceed forty cents—the difference, or $39 60 per head, being, as we think, the *net* annual loss to the northern States—*Tribune.*

HOW THE CASE STANDS.

WE have now in the States of the North more than seventeen millions of people, and if we should add thereto the population of the British Provinces, the sum would be nearly twenty millions. Annexation of those provinces can never take place while we continue so busily occupied in extending the area of Slavery, to which the people of Canada are so much opposed. They tell us frankly, in the language of the *Toronto Colonist*, that they will make no connection with us—

"that will empower the slave-driver to make Canada a hunting-ground. Human flesh and blood shall never be bartered in Canada like the beasts of the field. The baying of the blood-hounds shall never echo in our woods. If Mitchell wants 'a plantation of fat negroes to flog,' he will have to seek it in some other place than Canada. If Canada ever becomes a State of the Union, it will not be until its soil is soaked in blood."

Let the South realize its menace and depart in peace, and this difficulty will have no existence, while the advantages of union will be so great to the Provinces that, were the hindrance of Slavery removed, annexation would follow as a necessary consequence.

What, then, would be the real loss resulting from a secession by the South with a view to carry out its now favourite project of a great slave republic, embracing some of the slave States, Cuba, Brazil, and perhaps Hayti, if her people could be re-enslaved? We should lose the companionship of five millions of white men who give seven millions of votes, and thereby deprive the whole free people of the North of all control over their own actions, while taxing them hundreds of millions for the purchase and protection of territory sufficient to enable themselves to hold the reins of government. We should, on the other hand, gain a connection with two and a half millions of free people who sell their own labour, and therefore desire that "the hireling" should be largely paid. We should lose a connection with five millions who differ from us in all our modes of thought in regard to the rights of man, and gain a connection with half that number who agree with us in reference to that important subject. We should lose a connection with men who look only to exhausting their land and then abandoning it, and gain one in which every man is cultivating his own homestead, and therefore desirous of improving it for the benefit of himself, his wife and his children, and ready to unite with us in every measure tending to that result. We should lose a connection with a dead body and gain one with a living man.

Further than this, after the South had left, the North, by pursuing a policy tending to elevate the labourer, by diversifying employment, and thus increasing the demand for labour, would attract twice the number of immigrants we now receive, and would thus add so enormously to our numbers and our wealth, that we hesitate not to express our full belief that, in twenty years from this date, it would be richer and more populous than will be our present Union, if it be so long continued. Stronger it would certainly be, for Slavery is an element of weakness. More respectable it would certainly be, for we cannot command the respect of the world while appearing everywhere as the advocates of Slavery, and of the Fugitive Slave law. More moral would it be, for we should not covet the lands of our neighbour, any more than we desire to convert himself into a chattel. Examine the matter, therefore, as we may, the balance of profit and loss seems to us to be in favour of permitting our Southern friends to exercise their own judgment as to the time, manner, and extent, of secession. The *Charleston Evening News* thus states the question:

"It is vain to disguise it, the great issue of our day in this country is, Slavery or no Slavery. The present phase of that issue is, the extension or non-extension of the institution, the foundations of which are broad and solid in our midst. Whatever the general measure—whatever the political combinations—whatever the party movement—whatever the action of sections at Washington, the one single, dominant and pervading idea, solving all leading questions, insinuating itself into every polity, drawing the horoscopes of all aspirants, serving as a lever or fulcrum for every interest, class or individuality—a sort of directing fatality, is that master issue. As, in despite of right and reason—of organism and men—of interests and efforts, it has become *per se*, political destiny—why not meet it? It controls the North, it controls the South—it precludes escape. It is at last and simply a question between the South and the remainder of the Union, *as sections and as people.* All efforts to give it other divisions, to solve it by considerations other than those which pertain to them in their *local* character and fates, to divert it, to confound it with objects and designs of a general nature, are rendered futile. It has to be determined by these real parties, by their action in their character as sections—inchoate countries."

Such *are* the parties to this great question of the enlargement or contraction of the freedom of man—"sections—inchoate countries." How soon they will become really different countries—enemies in war, and in peace friends—depends upon the South, which has for thirty years threatened dissolution, and has thus far been conciliated only by the concession of almost unlimited power to buy land and create poor slave States with small population as offsets to large, populous and wealthy free States at the north. The cup of conciliation seems now, however, to have been drained; and if the Missouri Compromise be now repealed, even the dregs will scarcely we think be found at the bottom. That the monstrous Nebraska bill can become a law we do not now believe, nor do we believe that Southern gentlemen will generally be found advocating such an extraordinary violation of faith; but should they be found, and should the failure of this new attempt at the enlargement of slave territory and extension of slave power be followed by a determination on the part of the South to insist on their right of secession, why, the only reply that should be made is that of Senator Fessenden: "they need not put it off a day on our account."—*Ibid.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1854.

ORDER OF MEETINGS NEXT WEEK.

WE call the attention of all concerned to the following arrangements for meetings of the members and friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society, to be held in this City next week.

1. The Public Anniversary of the American Society will be held at the REV. DR. CHAPIN'S CHURCH, in Broadway, between Spring and Prince Streets, at 10 o'clock, A. M., on WEDNESDAY. The Speakers will be REV. W. H. FURNESS, D. D., of Philadelphia; REV. THEODORE PARKER, of Boston; MR. ROBERT PURVIS, of Byberry, Pa.; MISS LUCY STONE, of West Brookfield, Mass.; and WENDELL PHILLIPS, ESQ., of Boston.

2. The Society will hold its first meeting for business and general discussion, on WEDNESDAY, 3½ P. M., at the HOPE CHAPEL LECTURE ROOM, 718 Broadway (opposite Washington Place).

3. On WEDNESDAY EVENING, there will probably be no *public* meeting, but a gathering of the officers and active members and friends of the Society for private conference and consultation in respect to its affairs.

4. On THURSDAY, the Society will probably hold three public meetings—morning, afternoon and evening—at the HOPE CHAPEL LECTURE ROOM. The hours of meeting will probably be 9 A. M., 3 P. M., and 7½ P. M.

5. On FRIDAY morning, at 9 A. M., the Society will again assemble at the same place, and, unless its business should be completed at that session, will adjourn to meet again in the afternoon.

6. The New York (City) Society will hold its Anniversary at the BROADWAY TABERNACLE, on Friday evening, at 7½ o'clock, when addresses will be delivered by WENDELL PHILLIPS and others. Admittance 12½ cents; to defray expenses.

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURES IN BOSTON.

WE have spoken heretofore of a Course of Anti-Slavery Lectures that was commenced in Boston some time last winter under the direction of gentlemen having no connection with any organized Anti-Slavery movement. We have been informed that the measure was first suggested by Mrs. Stowe, who desired to secure the aid of Messrs. Garrison, Phillips, and others of their school, in the execution of the plan. But the clergymen of Boston, who were willing to take part in such a course of lectures at all, were unwilling, or at least did not think it expedient, to invite the co-operation of men whose fidelity to the cause in past years had made their names an offence to the ecclesiastical rulers of New England. While, for the sake of those clergymen themselves, we regretted this exhibition of weakness and half-heartedness, we yet hoped much from their efforts to enlighten the people of Boston upon the great question of Human Rights which had been so suddenly raised by the perfidy of party politicians. We were more than willing, for the sake of the cause, to pardon something to old prejudices, and in our joy at seeing popular and influential divines buckling on their armour for an honest tussle with Slavery, did not care for their refusal to fight by the side of older if not better soldiers than themselves. They doubtless thought themselves capable of doing good service "on their own hook," and that to co-operate openly with the maligned "Garrisonians" would impair their influence. If there was lurking in their souls an unworthy pride that forbade them to acknowledge, even by implication, that their former treatment of Abolitionists had been wrong, we were ready to console ourselves with the hope that that pride would be consumed in the fires of a new and well-directed zeal for the slave's deliverance.

But the result has proved that their wisdom was foolishness—their deference to expediency the cause of a marked failure of the plan from which so much had been hoped. It is our firm conviction, that, if they had marched boldly up to the line of justice, and, rising above all unworthy prejudices, proclaimed their willingness to co-operate with the old-line Abolitionists, they would have moved Boston as it was never moved before. Such an evidence of earnestness on their part would have aroused from the sleep of indifference thousands who, as it was, regarded the lectures only as the fruit of a spasm that would soon subside, and who, therefore, did not trouble themselves even so much as to listen to Anti-Slavery arguments from men whose previous experience had not qualified them to utter the highest wisdom. The Abolitionists are hated, not for any imprudence or fanaticism, but for their fidelity to the cause—a fidelity which the public, in spite of all the abuse that has been heaped upon their heads, sees and understands. And that public, when it gets converted to Anti-Slavery principles, will not seek its guides among those by whom it has been misled and bewildered hitherto. Hence any Anti-Slavery scheme which contemplates an ostracism of the old and faithful friends of the cause, however wise in other respects, must prove a dead failure. This is a lesson which we hope the managers of the Independent Course of Anti-Slavery Lectures in Boston have learned from the experience which an impartial hand has chronicled in the *Liberator* as follows:

The Boston course of lectures on American Slavery, "under the direction of an independent association of gentlemen," and having "no connection with any previously existing association," has, for reasons not difficult to conjecture, though none have been announced to the public by its managers, paused mid-way in its career. As a certain proportion of Abolitionists attended these lectures, it may be well for their sakes, and for the public good, to gather up such crumbs of information as the course has incidentally furnished.

The lectures were to be nine in number, six of which have been delivered, by the following gentlemen:

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER, of Brooklyn, N. Y.
" EDWARD BEECHER, of Boston.
HORACE GREELEY, of New York City.
REV. RICHARD S. STORRS, JR., of Brooklyn, N. Y.
" EDWARD E. HALE, of Worcester.
" ANDREW L. STONE, of Boston.

The remainder of the course, which will (perhaps) appear next fall, was announced to be by

JOHN JAY, of New York.
REV. CALVIN E. STOWE, of Andover.
" H. M. DEXTER, of Boston.

Of the six lectures thus far delivered, five were by clergymen. Of these, their own professions, and their own theory of the clerical function, give us the right to demand that they shall "rebuke sin without fear or favour," and declare, respecting it, "the whole counsel of God." But, though making very strong representations of the evils of Slavery (as slaveholders themselves constantly do), the majority of them counselled nothing more thorough than efforts against its *extension*, and expressed or implied their acquiescence in its indefinite continuance within its present boundaries, if this would avert the threatened extension. These lectures were "on Slavery," but were not *anti*-Slavery.

Another noteworthy circumstance is, that the lecturers last referred to seemed moved to oppose even the *extension* of Slavery, less from a conviction of inherent viciousness in the thing itself than from the inward disturbance and outward reproach accruing from it to the Church. In a word, the general tone and pitch of these lectures corroborated the idea that one might reasonably form from the characters both of the speakers themselves and of the "association" who selected them, namely, that the whole movement was rather a coming to the help of the Church than an assault upon Slavery, as hoplessly vicious and intolerable in itself; rather the perception that Slavery is an obstacle in the way, and a blot on the character of the Church, than that it is invariably a sin in the master and an injustice towards the slave.

It is a curious and instructive fact that, notwithstanding the *moderate* tone which was to be expected from the lecturers named, and the significant assurance, from press and pulpit, that there was no connection with anybody who had become unpopular by previous exertions against Slavery, the clergy of the city utterly withheld their countenance and support from this movement. The Beechers were present (officially, as it seemed) at all the lectures, but no other city clergymen appeared on the platform, to manifest their sympathy, nor did I distinguish any among the audience. The signature of the Nebraska petition was quite as much as could reasonably be expected of them.

The sheep naturally followed the example of the shepherds, and staid at home; further prompted to quiescence, no doubt, by the very unfavourable weather of three of the evenings. Most of the audiences were thin, to positive emaciation. The first lecture (gratuitous, and delivered by Henry Ward Beecher) filled Park Street Church to overflowing. For the remaining ones, a fee of ten cents was required, and only twice did the adience so much as half fill the hall, though they changed from the Tremont Temple to the medium-sized Melodeon, and from that to the small Meionaon. It was all in vain; the audiences shrank with the halls; and, whatever disadvantages of radicalism the "independent" managers escaped, it is evident that *moderation* did not "draw," except upon their purses, for the lectures must have fallen far short of paying their own expenses.

Thus has ended (two-thirds of) another of the attempts to treat the subject of Slavery more *judiciously*, and (as a result of this) more *successfully*, than the Abolitionists have done. These critic-experimenters have always found, and, I venture to predict, will find for some years to come, that the majority of Northern people object not mainly to the form or manner of Anti-Slavery work, but to the thing itself. Half-way measures towards a thing which the people don't care to undertake at all, will be no more acceptable to them than radical ones. C. K. W.

MR. GIDDINGS IN SELF-DEFENCE.

ON Thursday of last week, Ex-Gov. Smith, of Va. (familiarly called "Extra Billy"), in the course of a speech upon the Nebraska question, alluded to Mr. Giddings in the following terms:

"Who does not know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Giddings), when I was in Congress some years ago, offered resolutions declaring that it was lawful, in effect, for negroes to slay the wives and children of their masters?"

Mr. Giddings respectfully endeavoured to correct him by assuring him that he had presented no such resolutions, to which Mr. Smith replied:

"No, of course not *directly:* that would have been too provoking, too insufferable. But for his act, the gentleman received the benefit of a resolution or resolutions of this body that made him retire from the proceedings of Congress that he might go home and get Congress rebuked by the people. They sent him back by a majority diminished by two thousand, and he was *afraid to continue the experiment.*"

On the following day, Mr. Giddings, having obtained the floor for a personal explanation, gave the Virginia overseer a castigation that he will not soon forget. Having referred to the circumstances which led him to resign his seat in 1842, and shown by the records that the resolutions offered by him at that time, and for which he was censured by the House, had been grossly misrepresented by Mr. Smith, Mr. Giddings proceeded to say:

Sir, this body took it upon themselves to pass a vote of censure upon me for thus avowing my opinions, and the member from Virginia (Mr. Smith) voted for my censure. He now appears to think I should have bowed in silence like the slaves on his own plantation, that I should have received the rebuke with humility, and plied myself to the take of legislation under his surveillance. I could not recognise him as my master, nor this body as having authority to control me in the expression of my constitutional views. I hurled from me the petty despotism which they attempted to exercise over me. I did not remain in my seat one minute after the vote was declared. The liberties of my country had been purchased in part by the blood of both my paternal and maternal ancestors. At a more recent period I had myself borne arms in the war of 1812; and had I remained in my seat here, submitting to such tyranny, I should have disgraced my name and the Constitution of my country.

On reaching the first county in my district, on my way home, I was hailed by a people who appreciated my motives, and responded heartily to the course I had pursued. A meeting was called at the seat of justice; a distinguished lawyer of the Democratic party moved a resolution requesting me to stand as a nominee for re-election without the formalities of a regular convention. To this I consented; and, until the day before election, it was supposed, in that part of the district in which I lived, there would be no competitor. But, as was then said, an opposition was raised, in pursuance of advice sent from this city; yet, as I stated yesterday, I was re-elected by a larger proportion of the votes given than on any former or any subsequent occasion. Many of the Democratic party voted for me, and have since continued to vote for me. My majority was more than thirty-five hundred; but then the member from Virginia says it was diminished to two thousand, intending to represent my constituents as dissatisfied with my course. Why, sir, at one of the largest conventions ever met in that district, I was specially instructed to maintain the position I had assumed, without reference to the miserable efforts put forth in this body to control my thoughts and my action. I have intended to obey those instructions. Of that, however, my constituents are my judges; and they have given me some evidence of their approbation—for they have continued to send me here, to the present time.

Where are those who then assumed the unconstitutional power to censure me? And echo answers, Where? Why, sir, of the two hundred and twenty members then composing this body, one and *only* one monument of the people's mercy, beside myself, has continued to hold a seat here. They have departed. Several generations, like the member from Virginia, have since appeared here, and taken their departure also to the shades of political life.

The member from Virginia, at the close of that Congress, disappeared, and sunk out of view, into the tide of political forgetfulness, from whence he was again cast up in the political storm of 1852—a striking instance of political *resurrection.* But he comes back apparently bringing with him the same views of dictation and "overseerism" which he possessed when he left us ten years since. He seems unconscious of the progress which has been made in this body during the period of his confinement in political *purgatory.*

It is said of Dean Swift, that while relating an anecdote to a friend they became separated. After the lapse of ten years they again met, when the Dean, without a bow or other salutation, resumed his story with the simple introduction of "*as I was saying.*" So the member from Virginia, on again finding himself in this Hall, without a bow or salutation, introduces himself by a flourish of the whip, and in full livery declares himself the "*whipper-in*" of this Administration, and in merciless style he plies the lash to all who get off the track.

In the course of his remarks, the member said I was *afraid* to continue the experiment I had tried in presenting my resolutions. In other words, he charged me with submission to the usurpations of this House, of surrendering the freedom of speech. Sir, it gives me pleasure to say that this is the first time, in a service of twenty years, that I have ever been subjected to the charge of being a *doughface*, not *daring* to speak my views. I was aware that, judging from his speeches, the member must have regarded all who differ from him as poltroons; but I had not supposed he would take occasion openly, and in definite words, to charge any member with being *afraid* to speak his sentiments.

Well, sir, I *am* afraid to do wrong. I am afraid of giving just offence to any human being. But, sir, I would speak *truth* fearlessly. Among these truths, I would lay it down as an axiom, that none but "cowards" ever doubt the courage of their fellow-members. But should the member from Virginia think I treat him with less severity than he deserves, I hope he will attribute it to my usual good nature, and not to cowardice.

Mr. Giddings proceeded to show that, after having been triumphantly re-elected, so far from being *afraid* to repeat the doctrines for which he had been censured, he did emphatically reiterate them in a speech, from which he read the following passage:

"Had I been in the situation in which they were placed, with the same alternative before me, a cowardly submission to a slave-dealer, with Slavery and degradation to myself and posterity on one hand, or heroic effort, with freedom to myself and offspring on the other, I could not have hesitated to defend the liberty which God had bestowed upon me to the extent of every means within my control."

Mr Giddings continued:

Why did not the member from Virginia meet this doctrine in open debate like a man—like a statesman? Sir, he sat in silence. I endeavoured to use language that should admit of no misinterpretation. It was addressed to those who had dared to pass a vote of censure upon a Representative in this Hall. And I greatly desired to provoke some one of them to meet me before the country. They had sealed my lips while on trial, and under the previous question they had condemned me and my doctrine. I intended in that speech to defy their tyranny, to hold them up to the country as a set of men who, through ignorance or malice, had trampled upon the Constitution, upon the rights of the people, upon the privileges of the members of this House. The member from Virginia (Mr. Smith) had voted for my censure; I had appealed to the people; had returned to this Hall indorsed by the sovereign power, and I challenged him to the forum. There he sat in mute silence.

A prophet, in Bible times, is said to have kicked an *ass* into speech; but I could not do it. I endeavoured to follow Balaam's example, but failed in the effort. And now, after ten years' absence, the member's galled sides have become healed. He has found his way back to this body, but appears so have forgotten

"——Whether
The boot was made of neat or Spanish leather";

and now he charges me with not daring to maintain my position.

But I pass to another and the last point. Speaking of myself, he proceeds to say:

"At any rate, he did not get the resolutions repealed (referring to the resolutions censuring me); he came back here, and had the grace actually *to ask Congress to repeal the resolution.*"

Astonished at the utterance of such an unmitigated fabrication, I asked to set him right. I, sir, disbelieved that any man could could have obtained an election to this Hall who would thus openly, and in bold defiance of all truth and honour, state, as matters of fact, transactions which never had the shadow of existence. The circumstances flowing from that resolution of censure constituted an important era in my life. I scorned the attempt to control my action. I held it in unutterable contempt. I bade defiance to it, and to all who sustained it. The thought of asking its repeal never entered my mind, never flitted through my imagination, until the astounding falsehood was put forth by the member on yesterday. Had such resolution been presented, he could show it from the record. That he cannot do. It does not exist. It never did exist. Why, sir, my resolutions had gone forth to the country. They had been sanctioned by the whole people of the North. They had gone over the waters, had reached the eye of British ministers and British statesmen. That apology for an Administration, John Tyler, who then controlled the Executive power, had backed out of the demand on England; and so far as I or the public have any knowledge, the demand has never been renewed. My effort had a greater effect upon the action of this government, and upon the sentiment of the country, than I had expected.

My position was adverse to that entertained by the Senate, by the Executive, and by this House. In opposition to these branches of the Federal power, the country acknowledged the correctness of my doctrine. And I now look upon that as the proudest era of my life. My triumph was complete. I was willing that the resolution of censure, and those who voted for it, should go down and receive the approval or the condemnation of posterity. I never asked nor desired its repeal; nor did I ever hear its repeal spoken of until the member charged me, on yesterday, with asking "this House to repeal it."

MR. SMITH replied in the true slaveholding style, mingling weak sophistry with gross personal abuse. But he was effectually floored, and it would have been more to his credit if he had held his peace.

LAW IN KENTUCKY.—The murder of Prof. Butler, a school-teacher, at Louisville, some months since, is doubtless within the recollection of all our readers. Prof. Butler, it seems, in the exercise of his authority as a teacher, corrected a scion of the chivalry, whereupon two grown-up brothers of the lad armed themselves with pistols and a knife, stalked into the school-room, insulted the teacher with abusive language in the presence of his scholars, refused all his requests to be permitted to explain, denounced him as a liar, and then shot him dead with a pistol pressed close to his breast, and left him weltering in his blood! One would naturally expect that murder so deliberate and premeditated would meet a speedy and inevitable retribution. Not so, however. The murderers belonged to one of the oldest and richest families in the State, and were thus part and parcel of that insolent slaveholding aristocracy which rules over "poor white folks" about as rigorously as it does over the subservient blacks. To permit these scions of the chivalry to be hung for murdering only a schoolmaster was not to be thought of for a moment by the reigning aristocracy. The fiat went forth that they must be cleared at all hazards. The trial was removed from Louisville to a country village, in order to obtain a jury from the class whose habitual deference to the slaveholders would make them an easy prey to the machinations by which wealth and legal cunning so often defeat the ends of justice. Before such a jury Matthew Ward, the principal murderer, was arraigned. He was aided by the most eminent counsel in the State, among whom was Mr. Crittenden, late United States Attorney General, who volunteered his services for the occasion. Never was there a clearer case of wilful and deliberate murder. It was proved by unimpeachable testimony that Ward had revealed his deadly purpose beforehand and armed himself accordingly, while scholars of the murdered man, who witnessed the bloody deed, bore witness in the fullest and clearest manner to the truth as set forth in the indictment. This testimony was met by an utterly abortive effort to show that the schoolmaster struck the first blow, and by an imposing array of influential citizens who testified to the murderer's good character and mild and peaceable disposition. The prisoner rode to and from the Court-House in the carriage of an ex-Governor, while other distinguished dignitaries sought in various ways to impress the jury with a proper estimate of the sacredness of the murderer's neck. The result was that Ward was cleared!

The verdict caused an intense excitement at Louisville, where a public meeting was held on Saturday last, to denounce the parties concerned in the outrage. The meeting, after condemning the verdict of the trial, passed resolutions of censure against Mr. Crittenden, soon again to be of the United State Senate, and Mr. Wolfe, State Senator from Louisville, requesting each to resign their places, after their disregard of the cause of justice and popular sentiment; the one in volunteering a defence of the murderer, and the other in traducing the City of Louisville, in his argument before the Hardin County Court. The brothers Ward were at the same time requested to leave the State. When the meeting was over, a crowd of persons surrounded the house of the Ward family and burned the effigies of the two murderers upon the door-step. This is only the beginning of the end.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS is said

LETTER FROM PARKER PILLSBURY.—In the *Liberator* of last week is a letter from Mr. Pillsbury to Wendell Phillips, in which, after speaking of the circumstances that preceded the illness which has been the source of so much anxiety to his numerous friends, he gives the following account of the nature and progress of his disease and of the present condition of his health. He writes from Bristol, and from the hospitable home of that faithful friend of the Anti-Slavery cause and of its friends in America, Mr. JOHN B. ESTLIN:

The disease proved to be a flow of water to the chest [Hydrothorax], with all the ugly accompaniments, aggravated by a bad condition of the whole system, which had lasted me these two or three years past. Never could a wanderer have fallen into better hands than did I. The whole Eastern Hemisphere could not produce another place so exactly suited to all my needs as this. And when I spoke a word of gratitude, it was silenced by the declaration that they counted it one of the happiest occurrences in their whole lives that the event had been so ordered.

For a number of days, my disease wore a most alarming aspect. My own expectation of recovery was small. I had the best medical advisers the country affords, one visiting me twice a day for nearly a month, and bringing with him, for the first two weeks, another, whose judgment and skill are esteemed of the very highest character.

I have been reduced very low, but at present, appearances are desirably in my favour, though it will be long yet before my health, in all respects, can be fully restored. But to be able to be up, and to dress every day, and, in fine weather, to ride and walk abroad, are comforts which I now relish as never before. And the society and attentions of Mr. and Miss Estlin, their constant care for all my wants, even anticipating most of them, and the sympathies of surrounding friends, all these things together, make my present state one almost to be desired.

My health, for the last two or three years, has been much worse than any of my friends supposed. No day in midsummer has been warm enough for my extremities, while my brain, almost of course, has been correspondingly hot; and, at the same time, the pain in my back, or some other part, has been so severe as very often to keep me awake at night. But I strove and struggled on, dreading nothing so much as inactivity, when the times called so loudly for labour. To many, it may seem unfortunate in the extreme, that my fall was delayed until three thousand miles from home. At first, it so appeared to me; but now, there is a light in which every thing seems to me to have been ordered in a wisdom far superior to mine; and silently and submissively I bow to the dispensation. Home and home friends could have done no more for me than has been done. Indeed, should I judge English and Irish society by the two families whose guest I have been, and the few sympathizing friends who have been about me, I might conclude I had found Bunyan's, '*Delectable Mountains*,' and seek or covet no other Paradise. Truly, I was a stranger, and they took me in; sick, and they ministered unto me. The honour of Heaven is pledged for their reward.

Faithfully yours, PARKER PILLSBURY.

THE 'BLACK WARRIOR.'—The Cuban fillibusters are certainly a most unfortunate, not to say ill-used, people. Their most persevering attempts to create a respectable difficulty between this Government and that of Spain are, unhappily, most amicably settled almost as soon as they are started, and neither party seems disposed to go to fighting without a reasonable pretext. Spain evidently is determined that she will do no such thing if, by any possibility, it can be avoided, and however good our executive stomach may be for a broil, two is necessary to a quarrel as it is to a bargain. The 'Black Warrior' case, for a little while, looked promising to some people, but that too has ended, as we said it would, in a settlement. The Madrid correspondent of the (London) *Times*, who seems to be well informed, thus writes, under date of April 7th.

The day before yesterday M. Soulé, the American Minister here, received dispatches from his Government with instructions of a stringent nature with respect to the affair of the Black Warrior. To-day I learn that the matter was settled yesterday. Such business-like promptitude is so unlike what we are accustomed to in affairs where Spaniards compose one of the parties concerned, that I can hardly bring myself to believe in the correctness of my intelligence. I am assured, however, that it is to be depended upon; that M. Pezuela, the Captain General of Cuba, was found to be in the wrong, and that the Spanish Government at once admitted this, made the needful amends, and granted a pecuniary indemnity. This, however, does not settle the other point mooted in the President's message—namely, that power should be given to the Spanish authorities at Cuba to settle disputes arising there. This, I apprehend, will be more difficult to arrange, the Spanish home Government being traditionally jealous of its colonial delegates and unwilling to increase their powers.

A COLOURED IMPOSTOR.—We have received an English paper containing a report of the trial of a coloured man, at Brighton (England), who has been, for some time, imposing on the unwary in the different parts of the kingdom, and gaining a comfortable subsistence by appeals to the benevolent on the ground of his being a fugitive slave. Whether this is the first case of the kind that has occurred there, we do not know, but it is the first, we believe, which has been so publicly exposed. We trust it will serve to put the British Abolitionists on their guard. Such cases have not been unfrequent here, within the past few years, and they are far worse than those of begging impostors, as they necessarily excite suspicion against a class which, here at least, must often be without any other evidence of their character than their own assertion. The facts in this recent case at Brighton are thus related by Mr. Chesson, in a letter to *The Wesleyan:*

Considerable interest has been excited recently by the trial of a negro, named Reuben Nixon, for a series of successful impostures on persons interested in the work of emancipation. The trial took place at Brighton, where he had obtained several sums of money by representing himself as a fugitive slave. The principal evidence against him was given by Mr. Chamerovzow, the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to whom he was sent, three months ago, by Mr. Joseph Sturge. Nixon stated that he had been a favourite house-slave in the neighbourhood of Baltimore, but that, owing to the sale of his mother and his sister's husband, he became disgusted with Slavery, and sought, unsuccessfully, several times, to make his escape. After this, he said, he was taken to Charleston to be sold; but his master permitting him to go into the town, he succeeded in getting on board a vessel called the Summers, bound for Liverpool, where he secreted himself until sea-sickness compelled him to show himself, after which he was employed as cook's mate. Upon reaching Liverpool, he said, he landed penniless, as the captain of the vessel refused to give him anything. He then called upon a benevolent "Friend," Mr. Crossfield, of that town, who relieved him, and sent him on to Mr. Sturge, who gave him a sovereign, although he was not quite satisfied. Mr. Chamerovzow sent him to the Metropolitan Lodging House, and became accountable for the cost of his lodgings. Mr. Chamerovzow wrote to Liverpool about the Summers, but no such ship was known there. His suspicions became aroused, and the result of his further inquiries strengthened them. In the meanwhile the prisoner was preaching, and praying, and lecturing, both in the metropolis and in the provinces. At last Mr. Chamerovzow accused him of imposture, whereupon he began to cry, for which, the former says, he has a particular talent. On the next day he called upon Mr. C. again, to beg him not to let the young woman to whom he was engaged know that he had been guilty of falsehood. In a dramatic manner he fell down on his knees, on which Chamerovzow said: "Get up; if you kneel, let it be in private and to your God!" The next morning he came again, and wished Mr. C. to lend him some money to buy a marriage license; to which the other replied, "that he would not give him money for such a purpose, for he himself had been married in a more humble way!" Chamerovzow having previously received the information, charged him with having stolen a guitar at Belfast, which he admitted; and Mr. Calso informed him that he had made the young woman acquainted with his conduct, which very much agitated him. He went away and returned in a short time, and then confessed that his first tale was a tissue of falsehoods, and that he had never been a slave at all. Mr. Chamerovzow still befriended him on his professing penitence; but he still continued his old course of imposture; and the result was the evidence of Mr. C. against him at Brighton, where he was sentenced to pick oakum for three months, a less pleasant employment than that to which he seems to have been accustomed. The magistrates paid this well-merited tribute to Mr. Chamerovzow: "The Bench considers, Mr. Chamerovzow, that you have acted with great humanity, discretion, and judgment, in this matter."

THE WAR IN EUROPE.—The steamer Pacific arrived on Monday, but brought nothing of importance in relation to the war. One of Admiral Napier's ships had captured five Russian merchant vessels in the Baltic. The blockade of the entire Russian coast on that sea was about to begin. On the Danube there had been some fighting, but no decisive engagement. The Turks wait the arrival of the French and English forces, whose movements are so slow as to create doubts of the good faith of the allies. Meanwhile, the Russians are strengthening their defences.]

THE NEBRASKA BILL.—It is the opinion of many of the most sagacious opponents of the Nebraska Villany that Douglas's bill is killed, and buried, too, beyond hope of resurrection. But we are by no means sure that this is the fact. In the report of the proceedings of the House on Tuesday we find the following:

MR. RICHARDSON (Ill.) gave notice that early next week he shall endeavour to bring to the attention of the House the Nebraska-Kansas bill. He made this statement that gentlemen might be advised; he did not intend to steal a march on them.

A Voice—"At what time?"

MR. RICHARDSON—That will depend upon circumstances. The friends of the bill intend further to resort to every fair parliamentary means of bringing this question to the consideration of the House.

MR. COX said that he had had no intimation of the intention to bring this bill to a vote at the time indicated.

MR. RICHARDSON reminded the gentleman that he did not intended to press it to a vote, but to bring it up for consideration.

MR. COX agreed to that. He most heartily was a friend of the measure, and should express himself to that effect, should he have an opportunity.

MR. RICHARDSON said his desire was to have the discussion on the bill itself. If they should fail in that, there were other means by which, at a proper time, they could bring it before the House and get a vote on it.

MR. WASHBURN (of Ill.) desired to ask his colleague in what way he would bring it up?

MR. RICHARDSON replied he would advise the gentleman when he got ready to do it. He had now said all he desired to say.

FILLIBUSTERING IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, on Monday, Mr. Slidell (Whig), of Louisiana, offered a resolution instructing the Committee on Foreign Relations to inquire into the expediency of authorising the President of the United States, during any future recess of Congress, to suspend by proclamation, either wholly or partially, the operation of the Neutrality Laws, in order to allow the Fillibusters of the South full swing in their operations for revolutionizing and annexing Cuba. The gentleman acted under instructions from the Legislature of Louisiana, and he supported his resolution in a long speech, in which he attempted to show that there was a plan on foot for the emancipation of the Cuban slaves, and that the Government of the United States was bound to interfere for the protection of Southern institutions against so dangerous a scheme.

After some debate, the resolution was adopted, with the understanding that the question should be considered upon its merits after the Committee on Foreign Relations make their report. It is said that the Committee will not sanction the project. We shall see.

HON. JOSIAH QUINCY was in Congress in 1811, when Louisiana applied to be admitted *as a State*, and on the 15th of January of that year made a speech, in which he said:

"If this bill passes, it is my deliberate opinion THAT IT IS VIRTUALLY A DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION—THAT IT WILL FREE THE STATES FROM THEIR MORAL OBLIGATIONS; AND AS IT WILL BE THE RIGHT OF ALL, SO IT WILL BE THE DUTY OF SOME, TO PREPARE FOR A SEPARATION, AMICABLY IF THEY CAN, VIOLENTLY IF THEY MUST."

It is to be regretted that the whole North did not present this bold front to the South at that early period, for in that case the slaveholders, being thrown upon their own inadequate resources, would have been compelled long ere this to emancipate their victims.

THE SPEECH OF HON. THOMAS H. BENTON in opposition to Douglas's Nebraska Bill will be found in full in our present issue. Mr. Benton's peculiar relations to the Missouri Compromise, so called, and to the political parties of the past and present time, add not a little to the weight of his opinions and the impressiveness of his example in thus resisting this new scheme for the extension of Slavery. The speech is remarkable for compactness and vigour, and we do not wonder at the marked effect produced by its delivery. Mr. Benton puts the subject of Executive interference with the duties of Congress in the proper light.

THE PEOPLE OF CHESTER COUNTY, Pa., held a meeting last week to utter their testimony against the plot of Douglas & Co. for the extension of Slavery. Dr Wm. Darlington, the member of Congress from that District at the time of the adoption of the Missouri Compromise, presided. Among the resolutions adopted was one (introduced by J. A. Dugdale,) expressing approbation of the New England clerical memorial and of every other earnest and Christian effort on the part of ministers and churches, to avert the desecration of freedom and free principles in our beloved country.

THE MILWAUKEE RESCUE.—The Mass Convention of citizens of Wisconsin, called to take into consideration the recent efforts of the United States officers to enforce the provisions of the Fugitive Slave act, and to take such action in the premises as the crisis might appear to demand, assembled not many days since at Milwaukee. A series of resolutions, declaring the Fugitive Slave bill unconstitutional, was adopted, and followed by the organization of a State League and a recommendation to organize auxiliary associations of friends of freedom in the various Counties and towns.

MADE FREE.—George Weston, cook of the schooner Louisiana, of Cherrytown, Va., lying in the harbour of Mass., was taken before Judge Merrick, one of the Judges of the Supreme Court, on *habeas corpus*, a few days since, and set free. He was a slave in Virginia, where he has a wife and child, also slaves. The captain of the vessel did not attempt to enforce his claim, knowing that it would be useless to do so.

"THE WEST INDIES BEFORE AND SINCE EMANCIPATION," is the title of a work recently issued in London. The author is J. Davy, A. M., F. R. S. We gather this information from a paragraph in the British *Anti-Slavery Reporter* for April, wherein the receipt of the book, at too late an hour to permit any notice of its contents, is acknowledged.

THE WOONSOCKET (R. I.) PATRIOT, one of the very best country journals we receive, has recently been enlarged and improved in typographical appearance. The editor, Mr. Foss, richly deserves the substantial patronage which his paper has so long received.

GERRIT SMITH'S SPEECH on the Nebraska Question will appear in next week's *Standard*. It will occupy more than two of our pages, but probably we have not a single reader who will wish it were shorter.

COME TO THE ANNIVERSARY.—We embrace this last opportunity to urge all our readers, who can by any possibility do so, to come to the Anniversary. Appearances encourage the expectation that the meetings will be largely attended and more than usually interesting.

POLITICS.

THE Free Democrats of Pennsylvania are to hold their State Convention at Pittsburgh on the 20th inst.

——A State Convention to nominate an Independent ticket for State officers is talked of in Ohio, and meets with general favour. Several prominent Whig papers, among them the *Cincinnati Gazette*, have expressed their approval of the measure.

——The Pittsburgh *Commercial Journal*, a leading Whig paper, suggests that Judge Pollock should decline the Whig nomination for Governor, and the party unite in the support of David Wilmot or some other independent anti-Nebraska candidate, and thus secure the defeat of Bigler, whose position on Douglas's bill is, at the best, equivocal. Wilmot, being a Democrat, would divide his party, and if the Whigs would generally support him, he might probably be elected. We see no prospect, however, that such a union will be formed.

——Millard Fillmore, the man whose official signature gave an infernal vitality to the accursed Fugitive Slave bill, is seeking relief from the pain of that disgraceful obscurity into which he sunk at the close of his Presidential term, in a visit to his Southern masters, who are amusing themselves by nursing in his breast the hope of a political resurrection and a re-election to the Presidency in 1856. The man who lashed himself to an anchor, in the expectation of being wafted thereby across the Atlantic, was the very incarnation of sagacity and forethought, in comparison with the ambitious ex-occupant of the White House. Let him make the most of the faint praise and hollow adulation with which the slaveholders condescend to tickle his vanity while passing through their dominions, for that is all that he will ever receive at their hands, save the final kick by which they will make him know his place when they can no longer use him as their tool. If his friends don't want to be caught playing a silly part in a very ridiculous farce, they had better pocket the money wherewith they propose to start a newspaper at Washington to advocate his claims as a Presidential aspirant. We ask them nothing for this bit of advice, save to *remember*, if they do not follow it.

——Caleb Cushing, President Pierce's Attorney General, has made himself exceedingly odious in the eyes of many of his former political friends in Massachusetts. 'Algoma,' the Boston correspondent of the *Herald* (understood to be a leading Democratic politician and writer), says:

"Gen. Cushing arrived here on Wednesday morning, and proceeded to Newburyport. This is his first visit to Massachusetts since he left the State in February, 1853; and were it to prove his last, no man would regret it, for he has not a sincere friend in the whole State—not one man who would step across the street to save him from perdition. People are curious to know what has brought the General on here now, and he has that sors of enviable reputation which causes men to speculate within the bounds of wickedness as to his object. No one is so foolish as to dwell one moment on the possibility of his having made a journey for any good purpose. The most charitable supposition that has been expressed is, that he has come on for the purpose of foreclosing some mortgage or other, whereby he shall add to his possessions. Others are of opinion that he has in view a withdrawal from the Democratic party, now that fortune is setting against it, he having that extreme deference to the popular will that leads him to ever go with the majority; but that supposition is a little premature, though it will prove a sound one a year or two hence, if the evil days of the democracy should continue."

DOMESTIC CORRESPONDENCE.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CXLVI.

THE ARGUMENT.—*The Correspondent changeth his mind—And why—He distinguisheth himself from others and doeth justice to himself—Also the Whigs—He confesseth his mistake and accounteth for it—He describeth the history of the Webster Statue in the House—And who spoke and what—And how it was tabled—And chuckleth over the same—And telleth what the papers said—Especially the Post—He protesteth against Clinical Legislation—He trembleth for the Republic—He describeth an attack on the liberty of negro-catching—He philosophizeth upon it—And adviseth a Society for the Instruction of Foreigners in the difference between the steps to the White House and to the gallows—He obtesteth the loyalty of Boston, and proveth the same, &c. &c.*

BOSTON, May 2d, 1854.

I TOLD you in my last letter that I should not write to you again until after I had seen you in New York, at the Anniversary. But that nice sense of justice which is one of my most marked characteristics, and which so honourably distinguishes me from your Corresponding Editor (was *I* ever called "*a hyena*," I should like to know!), compels me to reconsider this determination. For I am happy to say that I did very gross injustice to our friends the Whigs in that letter, when I said that they had n't pluck enough to vote against the Webster Statue, though they would give a week's pay to dare to do it, and this though they had voted themselves a daily dollar extraordinary, or words to that purport and intent. For the first time in my life, I believe, I have proved a false prophet, and can only regard this unprecedented exception as the one which is proverbially necessary to prove a general rule. I had taken it for granted that the Whigs in the House of Representatives were no better than those in the Senate, and so jumped to the conclusion that they would swallow the Statue, Pedestal and all, at a gulp. But I am proud and glad to say that they were better men than I took them for, and threw that particular dose of physic to the dogs. Verily, there must be wisdom in a multitude of counsellers—though I have always inclined to the opinion that Solomon was mistaken when he made the remark. I can forgive them even for having empowered the Banks to smother the community with from fifty to a hundred millions of filthy rags as currency, in consideration of this admirable *bonus*. I can even forgive them the vexation I have felt in the sure and certain looking for of the necessary vote all winter.

The Resolves were reached in due course on last Thursday, I think it was, and a couple or so of Boston members, whom I never heard of before, and whose names it is therefore quite immaterial to hint at, made speeches in favour of their passage; also, Mr. Kinsman, of Newburyport, a gentleman once in partnership with Mr. Webster and one or two others. On the other side, Mr. Clarke, of Northboro', delivered the truth in all its keenness as to Mr. Webster's claims to such an honour from the State, and especially from the Whig party. Mr. Thayer, of Worcester, also made a calm and clear exposition of the whole matter and of the way in which it would be looked upon by the people of the State, and Mr. Warner, of Northampton, and Mr. Frye, of Bolton, also spoke on the same side. So strong was the effect of these speeches, or so clear the consciousness of the House of the sense of the Commonwealth on the matter, that it was finally laid on the table, on motion of Mr. Colt, of Pittsfield, the Whig leader, by *a unanimous vote!* And the next morning, upon motion to take it up again, there were only *eighteen* votes in favour of it. Thus the State has been saved from that disgrace, to say nothing about the expense. For "there was not only dishonour in it, but an infinite loss," as Trinculo says. And though it might have been more diverting to see the Whigs making fools of themselves, by erecting a graven image to the man who conquered his prejudices in their favour before he died, and did what he could to demolish them and their candidate, still it would be rather an expensive amusement, and, for one, I am willing to forego it. And I imagine I am in a large majority for once.

The Webster Whig papers, of course, were vehement in their indignation; but it was of no use, except to gratify the Free Soilers in the Legislature, to whom they gave all the honour. But the most comical editorial expression which was drawn forth by this action was that of the Democratic *Post*, edited by President Pierce's Naval Officer, who was indignant at the disgraceful conduct of the Whigs who treated in this way a man whom they professed to regard as their friend! Now, this is precisely what the great mass of the Whig party do not profess to do towards Mr. Webster, and there was no more sense in their voting for a statue to him, as Whigs, than there would have been in the Federalists voting one to John Quincy Adams, had he died in 1807—begging pardon of his shade for naming his name in such a connection. But the *Post* omitted to blame *the Democrats* in the House, who must have united in the unanimous vote to table the Resolves, who were the only persons there under any political obligations to Mr. Webster. But, however it was done, it is done, and probably will not be attempted again. And in view of it, as I have said before, I can overlook even the puffing up of the Bank Balloons, now almost ready to burst, and yet more readily their adding a third to their pay, and making us pay in addition the doctors' and nurses' bills of their sick members. This is a new feature in legislation, I believe, and I trust confined to Massachusetts. I look upon it as a bounty for the encouragement of ill-health, and an inducement to towns to send up members likely to fall sick or die, for the purpose of getting the expenses of their sickness and funeral out of our pockets. I hold it to be anti-Republican and of a tendency to create a morbid Aristocracy of invalids or hypochondriacs, supported at the public expense. I am not sure that it does not come within the purview of that clause of the Constitution guaranteeing to every State a Republican Form of government. At any rate, it puts the whole State into that most deplorable political category of "Unhealthy Organizations."

We were refreshed last week by a fanatical demonstration in a quarter whence it was strange to see it come. A vessel was brought into port, the crew in irons, and taken charge of by the United States Marshal, and prosecuted by B. F. Hallet, the United States District Attorney, and all for what, do you think? Why, merely for proposing to go to the Coast of Africa and get a cargo of the raw material out of which the Corner Stone of our Republican Institutions has been hewn! Had he been engaged in carrying away slaves from the coast of Maryland and Virginia, in the wrong direction, there would have been some sense in it. The Captain was taken before a United States Commissioner, and instead of being invited to a public dinner, or nominated for the Presidency of the United States, he was committed to jail to await his trial. It is odd what a difference latitude and longitude make in human actions! Had this enterprising mariner only directed his operations to the coast-wise traffic, instead of going into the foreign trade, he would have been eligible to office, and might become a fructifying member of any church, and had the chief of the respectability and of the piety of the country to stand by him. It is hardly necessary to say that he is a foreigner. A native American would hardly be guilty of such an indiscretion. And we cannot but hope that after a brief detention, he will be acquitted by a jury of National patriots and be bid to go and sin no more, but to engage in the honourable and fair trade in negroes from Baltimore and Georgetown instead of the Guinea coast. We should be lenient towards those who, from the misfortune of not being born in a free and enlightened country, fall into the venial errors of this unfortunate gentleman. It would not be a bad idea in these days of Emigrant Societies and Associations for the Information of Strangers, to have one established for the instruction of foreigners in the niceties of our polity, so that, when they think they are in the highway to the steps of the White House they may not find themselves mounting those of the gallows.

You must not infer from this somewhat anomalous proceeding, that Boston is in anywise falling short in her loyalty to the Constitution and the Union. The city is still ready to perform its part of the duties it owes to these authors and supporters of its existence, as you may judge from the following extract from the Report of the City Property.

POLICE DEPARTMENT.

The following articles are in charge of the City Marshal, and are kept for use in his Department, viz.:

Thirty-three Iron Stakes, with Ropes, and about 700 feet of Chains attached, used for the purpose of closing up Streets, and for *other purposes*, on occasions which require such precaution.

And for further assurance of our allegiance we show in this inventory of our possessions,

"Three large American Ensigns."

The first of these properties (to speak theatrically), are of course the stakes and chains used to keep the stones of the Court-house from rising up and crying shame to Tom Sims at the time he tried to dissolve the Union; and the last the Star Spangled Banners which wave over us on all occasions of Brag Extraordinary. I trust that these items will relieve your mind of any misgiving as to the position of Boston at this time, and from any apprehension which this interference with a kidnapper on the high seas might suggest, that we shall not be still ready to protect and comfort any kidnappers on the highways. There is no reason to doubt our soundness on all essential points, or rather on the catching of negroes, which is well established by the authority of all healthy Statesmen and the sanction of all sound divines, to be the sum and quintessence of the duty of a Free, Enlightened and Intelligent American Citizen.

D. Y.

SUMMARY.

Massachusetts has invested the sum of $759,000 in institutions for the poor and insane.

Rev. Hosea Ballou, President elect of the Universalist College, which is soon to be completed at Somerville, is about to sail for Europe.

The Rev. John Humphrey, son of President Humphrey, of Amherst College, has been elected to the chair of Moral Philosophy of Hamilton College.

Wm. H. Burleigh, formerly a resident of Syracuse, but more recently of Albany, has resigned the office of Corresponding Secretary of the State Temperance Society.

Delia Webster was tried a fortnight since, in Trimble County, Ky., on a charge of abducting slaves (helping them to gain their liberty) and acquitted, there being no particle of evidence against her.

The unimproved lands of Oregon are so barren that a surveyor writes: "I think the United States ought to make Great Britain take it all back or fight. Thank God we did not go up to 54 deg. 40 min.; 49 deg. is bad enough."

In the case of George P. Southwick against the city of Boston, the jury on Saturday, April 29, gave a verdict for the plaintiff, fixing the damages at $12,000. Mr. Southwick fell into a cellar-way, breaking his back, and sued the city for damages.

Old John Adams, in a letter addressed to his wife, dated July 7, 1774, inquires—"Does Mr. Willblind preach against oppression and the other cardinal vices of the times? Tell him the clergy here, of every denomination, not excepting the Episcopalian, thunder and lighten every Sabbath."

VERMONT.—Famous for the production of *four* great staples, namely, *men, women, maple sugar* and *horses*.

The first are strong; the last are fleet;
The second and third are exceedingly sweet;
And all are uncommonly "hard to beat."

J. G. SAXE.

HARVARD COLLEGE.—According to the catalogue of the College, just issued, the number of students in the various departments is 699. The number of under-graduates, 329. The Dudleian Lecture has been deferred from the 10th to the 17th of May. It will be delivered by Rev. Dr. Bacon, of New Haven.

'What!' said Senator Badger, 'debar me from the privilege of taking mammy to Nebraska?' 'No,' said Wade, of Ohio, 'we only want to prevent your *selling* your "mammy" when you take her there.' This, it appears, was a settler, for if Badger made any rejoinder, the *Congressional Globe* does not record it.

DEATH FOR A BLOW.—A negro man, Merritt, the property of Mr. H. T. Street, of Charleston, has been tried before a Court composed of magistrates and freeholders, and convicted of assault and battery upon a white woman. The penalty is death, by the laws of the State, and the convict was sentenced to be hung on the first Monday in May.

ESTATE OF MR. WEBSTER.—According to an advertisement in a Concord (N. H.) paper, George W. Nesmith, Esq., of Franklin (Old Salisbury), is appointed a "commissioner to allow the claims of creditors against the estate of Hon. Daniel Webster," which is decreed to be administered as an insolvent estate.

Parson Brownlow, of Tennessee, made a brief speech at the Commercial Convention at Charleston, which he ended thus: 'I therefore conclude my remarks, by Resolving, firstly, That the Island of Cuba is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; Resolved, secondly, That he intends it for the saints of the South; and, Resolved, thirdly, That we are the saints.'

The municipal authorities of Boston have engaged Rev. A. L. Stone, of Park Street church, to deliver the oration on the coming fourth of July. This service has usually been assigned to some hopeful scion of one of the "first families." How does it happen that a Free Soil clergyman is this year called on to be the City's Fourth of July orator?

A coloured man named George R. Roberts, over seventy years of age, a well known resident of Baltimore, is on a visit to Washington in quest of a pension for services rendered during the last war with England. He was a privateer, and served with Capt. Boyle, who blockaded the ports of Great Britain with a little brig! He was taken prisoner, carried to Jamaica, and, with half a dozen others, barely escaped the honours of "yard-arm promotion."—*Nat. Era.*

A pet rat (says the *Republican* of Springfield, Mass.) is the strangest of ideas, yet it is most fully realized in one belonging to and educated by Mr. Aaron Howe, Jr., of this city. The little animal is harmless, playful and devotedly attached to its master. It will run about his clothes, mount his shoulders, steal into his pockets and perform various simple tricks at his bidding. The animal avoids others of its species, and seems perfectly contented and happy in its new life.

A MODEL SPEECH.—We commend the following pertinent speech to some who are troubled with long-winded-ness in several localities this side of Maine.

George W. Snow, having been unanimously re-elected City Clerk of Bangor, made a speech to the electors. He said:

"Gentlemen: You have given me all your votes, and I give you all my thanks. I accept the office and wish you to accept the thanks."

It is understood that both parties were satisfied, and nobody yawned over the speech.

ADVANTAGES OF A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION.—"Doctor," said an old lady, the other day, to her family physician, "kin you tell me how it is, that some people is born dumb?" "Why, hem! Why certainly, madam," replied the doctor: "it is owing to the fact that they came into the world without the power of speech!" "La, me!" remarked the old lady, "now jest see what it is to have a physic education: I've axed my old man more nor a hundred times, that air thing, and all that I could ever get out of him was, kase they is."

INSCRIPTION FOR THE WEBSTER MONUMENT.—When the Webster monument, or statue, or obelisk, is agreed upon, some inscription will be necessary. It seems proper that it should be in Latin as well as in English. Here is one taken from the ancients which will be excellent, only the names are altered from the original:

"Marmoreo Websterus tumulo jacet; Hancockus nullo,
Adamus parvo. Quis putet esse deos?"

Webster lies 'neath a marble pile; John Hancock has none,
Sam Adams but a small one. Who would think there was a higher law?

Mr. James Moore, a revolutionary veteran, died on the 5th inst., at Methuen, Middlesex County, Mass., in the 100th year of his age. His death was caused by injuries received by a fall on the ice, in January last, previous to which time he was accustomed to walk twelve miles a day—so extraordinary, considering his advanced age, was the vigour and elasticity of his frame. During the Revolutionary war he was employed in furnishing clothing for the American army; and he beheld, from the shores of Staten Island, in 1776, the English fleet, under Sir Wm. Howe, enter the harbour of New York.

The Baltimore *Sun* thus notices the last lectures of Miss Ann Preston in that city. Miss Preston is a graduate of the Female Medical College of Philadelphia: "This lady has consented to repeat the course of lectures recently delivered before a number of the ladies of Baltimore. We take occasion to commend the subject to the attention of our female readers, as one peculiarly entitled to their consideration. Treated by a competent person, as we have reason to believe this lady is, much valuable and practical information may be acquired by attendance upon her lectures, and we therefore commend them earnestly to public attention."

THE WHEAT CROP.—The editor of the Chicago *Tribune*, who has recently made an excursion through Canada, New York, a part of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio and Indiana, reports that the indications of a fair wheat crop in all of those States are favourable. In New York, the fields have suffered some from frost, but favourable weather during May and June will cause a good yield in the aggregate. In the southern counties of Indiana, the prospects are said not to be very good; but the section is not a wheat-growing one, and a partial failure there cannot sensibly affect the result of the crop of the whole State.

REMARKABLE FAMILY REUNION.—Col. IRA K. Miller, of Pawtucket, Mass., is the father of thirteen children, all of whom are living. Three of the daughters are married, and they together have six children, and reside in different States. On Thursday of last week (fast day, 6th ult.), all the children and grandchildren and the three sons-in-law assembled, without invitation or consultation, at the Colonel's residence, forming, together with the Colonel and his wife, a group of twenty-four persons. Col. M. hired the largest omnibus in town and had the whole party conveyed to Wright's daguerreotype rooms, where likenesses of all of them were taken on one plate.

A TURKISH AMAZON.—A singular spectacle has been witnessed in the streets of Constantinople to-day. A Turkish woman in man's apparel, armed to the teeth and mounted upon a splendid horse (not *sidesaw* but *otherwise*, according to the manner of Turkish ladies), paraded the streets at the head of three hundred soldiers, whom she has equipped, and will lead to the war against the insurgent Greeks of Epirus and Thessaly, at her own charges. She appears to be a person about sixty years of age, and is said to be unmarried, which though a very unusual circumstance in regard to Turkish females, is very likely to be true in her case. She retains the *Yasmak*, Turkish veil, but wears it thrown back upon her shoulders.—*Cor. N. Y. Observer.*

THE GUARDIAN OF FRIENDLESS GIRLS.—An association has been organized in Boston to take charge of vagrant and friendless girls who are found running in the streets and liable to fall into crime. It proposes to take charge, where it is possible, of those who have not yet become offenders, and, with permission of the Courts, to take possession of those arraigned for crimes; to provide them a temporary home in the city, instruction in some means of getting a living, and obtain homes, for such as need them, in families residing in the country towns of New England. Rev. John T. Sargent is the agent of this association, and among those who are active in its management are Edmund Jackson, Rev. Theodore Parker, and Wendell Phillips.

The following characteristic letter was written by Gerrit Smith to S. M. Booth, Editor of the Milwaukee *Free Democrat*, on hearing of his arrest on charge of participating in the rescue of Glover:

"WASHINGTON, March 23, 1854.

"*My Dear Friend and Brother:* God bless you, and He will bless you. Your letter, received this morning, has filled me with joy. You are aware what a responsible part I took in the rescue of Jerry. I determined, from the first, that, if I were indicted, I would not give bail—I would go to jail.

"I trust that you will not give bail. I trust you will avow the whole extent of your participation in the rescue of Glover, and glory in it.

"Glorious Milwaukee! Glorious Rescue!'

"Truly yours, GERRIT SMITH."

PRINTERS' STRIKE.—The journeymen printers of Mount Vernon, Ohio, have been thrown into great excitement by an attempt on the part of Mrs. Bloomer, to introduce lady printers into her office to assist in setting the type of the *Lily*, which is published at that place. The lady employed writes that, having been engaged to set type in a printing office where men were at work, she was subjected to sundry annoyances by her unwilling associates, who finally, on being required by their employers to give her such instruction as they would give any apprentice, refused, struck in a body, and entered into a compact with all the journeymen printers in the town to sustain each other, and not to work in any office where a woman was employed.

The Boston *Post* says, that at a meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, held soon after the death of ex-President John Quincy Adams, who was one of its members, Hon. Josiah Quincy was requested to prepare a memoir of Mr. Adams for publication in the next volume of the society's collections. At the annual meeting on Thursday, a letter addressed to the society by Mr. Quincy was read, stating that his work had increased on his hands to such a degree that it would require more space than the whole of one of the society's ordinary volumes; and he asked to be released from the duty of preparing the memoir, on the condition that he should have the liberty of presenting the whole edition of his life, together with the copyright to the society. A committee, consisting of Hon. John C. Gray, George Ticknor, Esq., and Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, was appointed to accept the proposition with appropriate acknowledgments for the generous offer.

A rumour having obtained currency that Rev. Henry Ward Beecher was likely to accept a call to preach in Washington, the *Star* of that city says if he preaches there as he ordinarily preaches elsewhere, "the people of Washington will pay him in tar and feathers." How strangely such language sounds in the ears of real republicans; and its author will be ashamed of it when he becomes conscious of the universal disgust which it excites.—*Alb. Eve. Journal.*

It take a "Northern man with Southern principles" to do the dirtiest work of Slavery. The appearance of so disgraceful a paragraph, in the Washington paper quoted by the *Journal*, may be explained by stating that S. Corning Judd, who formerly twinkled as the "*Star*" of Syracuse, has recently became connected in some capacity with the paper of that name in Washington. *He* never "will be ashamed" of *anything*, because incapable of appreciating "the universal disgust" which his utterances excite.—*Oneida Telegraph.*

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE VINDICATED.—A case was tried at Lowell, last week, in the Supreme Court, Judge Metcalf presiding, in which John Henry Harris, a coloured man, recovered *fifty eight dollars* of Granville Whitcomb and others, Selectmen of the town of Boxboro', for refusing to receive his vote for John P. Hale, for President, in 1852. Harris was a citizen and legal voter of Boxboro'; but having shut up his house, and come to Boston to work during the summer of 1852, the Selectmen struck his name from the list, and refused to let him vote. As his vote would have been given for a good cause, it was too valuable to be wrongfully suppressed, and he therefore brought a suit against the Selectmen for unlawfully denying him the exercise of his right of suffrage. Farley and Griffin appeared for the plaintiff, and B. F. Butler for the defendant. The verdict of $58, given by the jury in this case, was just, and we trust it will teach a salutary lesson to town officers, that they should be cautious in the exercise of their power to deprive men of their right of voting.—*Boston Com.*

SINGULAR EXCITEMENT.—It would seem from the following, that the good people of New Haven, as far back as 1779, were as much concerned about the *price* of rum, as they are at the present day in reference to its use:

"Vote of New Haven, in town meeting, legally warned, holden August 6th, 1779.

"Whereas, a complaint hath been made to this meeting, that some persons have lately sold rum at an exorbitant price, and others have withheld and refused to sell—Voted, that this town *doth disapprove* of any person asking and receiving a greater price than *thirty two dollars* per gallon*, by retail, for good West India Rum; and for New England rum in proportion; and also of any person withholding the same; and that this town will *treat with proper contempt*, all persons who shall refuse to sell their rum, or shall sell the same at more than the above mentioned price. And that Capt. Abel Burrett, Capt. Moses Gilbert, Dr. Levi Ives, and Capt. Peter Johnson be a committee to communicate this vote."

* Supposed to be Continental money.

TELEGRAPH ACROSS THE ATLANTIC.—The mail from Newfoundland brings intelligence of the charter of a company by the title of "The New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company." The ultimate object of the gentlemen interested in this project is the establishment of a sub-marine telegraph, to connect Newfoundland with Ireland. The New York, Newfoundland and London Telegraph Company have bought the lines already erected by the Newfoundland Electric Telegraph Company, and have their plans so far advanced as to believe that St. Johns, Newfoundland, will be in telegraphic communication with all the cities in the Union by the end of September next.

Until the ocean telegraph is completed, we hope that the various lines of steamships between here and England, will call either at St. Johns or Tregassey, N. F., both going and coming, for the purpose of receiving and delivering despatches. The gentlemen appointed by the charter as directors are Messrs. Peter Cooper, Moses Taylor, Cyrus W. Field, Marshall O. Roberts, and Chandler White, whose names alone are sufficient guaranty of the success of the enterprise.

ORIGIN

Miscellaneous Department.

JOSEPH HUME.

In an English family, the most stupid of the boys is usually intended for a parson. It is not so in Scotland. There, the most promising and intelligent is devoted to the kirk, and the least capable and intellectual is designed for a member of parliament—that is, supposing him to be unfit for anything else. This is an inference fairly warranted, by the general stupidity which is the most prominent characteristic of English divines, and of Scottish legislators. It is but right, however, to state that there is another theory which professes to account for the lack of talent by which the Scotch representatives are mainly distinguished. They are said to possess talent of a very high order; but they are afraid to display it, lest they should be found to bear the slightest resemblance to the Irish members. Hence, the ruling idea with the Caledonian Solons is to be as unlike as possible to their Hibernian fellow-senators. Thus, to a certain extent, the distinctive characteristics, and ancient reputations, of both Ireland and Scotland are well maintained by their respective representatives in the imperial legislature. For instance, the Irish members are reckless, and clamorous; the Scotch, cautious, and forbearing. The former, discontented with everything, and with everybody; the latter, resigned to every event, and satisfied with every measure, which Providence, or the government, may choose to offer. To-day, if we may use an expressive colloquialism, the "Irish Brigade" are "pitching into" the Saxon with the most "beautiful" and edifying unanimity; to-morrow, they are equally unanimous in pitching into themselves. Mr. Lucas calls Mr. Keogh a "renegade and a traitor"; "the active agent of corruption"; "one who has sold his country for a mess of government pottage," &c. Mr. Keogh is not to be outdone in courtesy; accordingly, he terms Mr. Lucas "a sneaking slanderer," and a "moral assassin"—"one who is not the greatest of criminals" simply because he is "the greatest of cowards." We have thus verified, before our eyes, the fable of the Kilkenny catastrophe, when the fury of the contending cats was such that they mutually devoured each other, with the trifling exception of a small portion of their respective tails. Mr. Lucas and Mr. Keogh are both "honourable men"; and, as such, we are bound to credit the testimony which each has borne to the character of the other; but, in this case, it is obvious that nothing but the most insignificant, fagend of a reputation is left for either gentleman wherewith to bless himself, or to serve his country or his constituents. The Scotch members go to the other extreme. They are as much distinguished by their silence as the Irish by their noise. To annoy the minister as much as possible, seems to be the height of Hibernian ambition; to please him, is the climax of the Caledonian's. Because the Irish ask for too much, the Scotch ask for nothing at all. Unless it be on some question of local importance—such as the Great Glen-mutchkin Railway, or the Kilbokie Cemetery, or the Dalwhackett Water-works, or the presentation of a petition "against the opening of the Crystal Palace on the Lord's-day," or for the withdrawal of the annual grant to the Temple of Juggernaut, and the College of Maynooth—the voice of a Scottish member is seldom, or never, heard upon a question of national or imperial importance; and, to all intents and purposes, with the exceptions before mentioned, Scotland might as well have been represented in the great national council by a set of cast-iron dumbies. Indeed, the Scotch members resemble a man who went with his mouth gagged, and his arms tied, because he had seen another man who was always blackguarding with his tongue, and fighting with his hands. This is certainly a humiliating position for the representatives of an ancient nation to occupy; but the fact is, that both Scotland and Ireland labour under the brand of provincialism; and while the representatives of the one are nuisances, those of the other are mere nonentities.

But there is no rule so absolute as to have no exception; and Joseph Hume is a singular exception to the general insignificance of the Scottish members of parliament. His mind is not exclusively occupied with private Bills, and local legislation. Questions of importance to the country at large, and even to the world, are indebted to Mr. Hume for light thrown upon them, and for an impetus imparted to their progress. Tried by an ideal standard of absolute perfection, Mr. Hume will be found to be very imperfect and defective in many of the qualities which constitute a great statesman. He is too much the votary of expediency. He is too prone to give a discharge in full for a paltry instalment. A measure of reform, which has been extorted from the minister by terror, and which is given more with the view of defrauding of a right than of redressing a wrong, Mr. Hume is too apt to regard as an instance of liberality and generosity, for which the people cannot be too fervent in their gratitude, or too profuse in their thanks. That which is only difficult, he too frequently confounds with the utterly impracticable. He believes that the condition of the working classes is susceptible of great improvement; but he does not believe in the possibility of superseding the present system of wages-slavery. He is a firm believer in the principles, and a devout disciple of the school, of the political economists. The salvation of the people he believes to depend upon "buying in the cheapest, and selling in the dearest, market"; and between the living human labour which creates, and the dead commodity which is the insensate result of that labour, he is not disposed to make any difference. Both, he considers, are, and ought to be, equally subject to the law of supply and demand. He is, therefore, strongly opposed to any legislative attempts to protect the helpless labourer from the rapacity of his powerful and unscrupulous employer. His advocacy and support of the *laissez faire*, or let alone, system is the grand flaw in the political character of the member for Montrose.

If, however, we try him, not absolutely, but relatively—by comparing, or rather contrasting, him with his contemporaries—the character of Mr. Hume, both as a man and as a politician, will appear in a much more favourable light. In liberality of opinion—in consistency of conduct, firmness of purpose, purity of motive, and constancy of application—it is not too much to affirm that Joseph has no superior, if he has an equal, in the present Great British and Irish parliament. When the history of his age comes to be written, the faithful historian will record it to his honour, that Joseph Hume, without ever having spoken against religion, was always opposed to the pious, or rather impious, cant by which reason is insulted and religion disgraced. He has braved the howl of the bigot—he has exposed the selfishness of the sectary—he has resisted the pretensions of the priesthood. He has always maintained that the Sunday belonged to the people, and not to the parsons. He has always advocated—and thereby incurred much obloquy and enmity—the opening of museums, galleries of art, national parks, railways, and crystal palaces, and other such agencies of popular refinement and education, on the only day in the week when those ameliorating institutions are accessible to the working classes of this country. But his peculiar work—and that with which his name shall always be identified—is the economical expenditure of the nation's money. It is now two-and-forty years since he first entered parliament, and ever since that period he has been the fearless and unwearied exposer of royal rapacity and aristocratic robbery. As a matter of course, the parties who profited by jobbery in places, and who were enriched by the plunder of the people's money, were enraged at the attempt to deprive them of their subsistence. Mites and maggots, being the progeny of corruption and decay, are not naturally enamoured of soundness and strength. The kite, the crow and the vulture would prefer a people given to carnage, and a plain strewn with carrion, to a society peaceful and prosperous, and to fields waving with the golden corn. Even so is the government which promotes extravagance, and provides rich sinecures for the bastard brood of royalty, and for the idle and incapable scions of our "old nobilitie," more consonant with the views and interests of the ruling class in this country. These, by the very necessities of their nature, and the law of their being, were furious at the Reformer who endeavoured to destroy the corruption in which they battened. "Atheist," "infidel," "revolutionist," were some of the epithets hurled at Mr. Hume in the commencement of his career. Nor is it so very long since those pleasant and polite appellatives have ceased to be applied to the veteran Reformer. It is only a few years since the pious *Record*—that charitable print which consigns all but the evangelical elect to the uncovenanted mercies of the Almighty—said that no Christian constituency ought to elect Mr. Hume as its representative, *because* a subscriber of that religious journal once, in a railway carriage, had a conversation with the veteran Reformer, in the course of which that gentleman had stated that there were many things in Paine's "Rights of Man" with which he perfectly agreed. This the *Record* considered the very acme of impiety; and poor Joseph was, accordingly, consigned to the outermost darkness of everlasting reprobation. Of course the organ of the evangelicals was not aware that many orthodox clergymen—and even Pitt himself, the "heaven-appointed minister" of the Tories—had both entertained and expressed unqualified admiration of many passages in that incomparable treatise.

The member for Montrose, however, was proof against them all. The sneers of the frivolous, and the scowls of the ferocious, failed to divert him from his purpose; and there can be no doubt that to the exertions of Joseph Hume the nation is indebted for the savings of hundreds of thousands of pounds annually. Of late years, however, the various governments have adopted different tactics in their dealings with Mr. Hume. Having found the irritating and intimidating system unsuccessful, they have resorted to the cajoling and soothing system. He is no longer laughed at, or abused. He is now profusely bespattered with praise and compliments; and it must be admitted that, to all appearance, this system has been much more effectual in mollifying the zeal, and mitigating the severity, of the Reformer. Joseph Hume was always good-natured, but ever since the eulogistic method has been practised, he is excessively amiable, and almost affectionate, both to the senile and suckling members of the aristocracy. Of late, he touches an abuse not as if he loathed, but as if he loved, the nuisance—so gently he does his spiriting, so tenderly and delicately is his handling of the subject. He is also possessed of unbounded faith in the good intentions of the aristocracy, and of a charity so expansive that it suffices to cover the innumerable multitude of their transgressions. He is, moreover, the victim of a most unnaccountable hallucination. In this, however, his case is not peculiar. In every age, and in every country of the world, the wisest men have been subject to the strangest delusions. Socrates believed in a prompting demon, by whom he was always attended; Luther, in a malicious imp, by whom he was always flouted; Dr. Johnson, it is well known, believed in the second sight and in the Cock-lane ghost; and Robert Owen, it is equally well known, believes in the rapping revelations of the defunct Duke of Kent. But none of these are at all comparable, in their grossness, to the particular hallucination under which Joseph has of late laboured. He actually believes that Lord John Russell is pregnant with, and some day will be delivered of, "a large and comprehensive measure of parliamentary reform"! The very copious annals of wonderful delusions will be searched in vain, to discover another sufficiently preposterous to match with this. The belief of Johanna Southcote—who, when she was about the same age as the noble lord, the member for the City of London, imagined herself big with the promised Shiloh—was a tame, reasonable and probable belief, compared with the monstrous credulity which can believe that Lord John Russell is destined to be either the father or the mother of any measure of reform but the most malformed abortion that ever was conceived by aristocratic impotence, or brought forth by the democratic forceps, from the barren womb of the political Johanna Southcote of the house of Bedford. Let us hope that this delusion of Joseph Hume is not symptomatic of that decay of mental vigour which is one of the frequent characteristics of the venerable age at which he has arrived. I should be sorry to think that "Old Joe" was failing, because, for one that we have better, we have ten thousand worse.

To attempt a description of the personal appearance of a man so well known as Mr. Hume, would be alike superfluous and impertinent. Suffice it to say, that there is not within the walls of parliament, when the proudest and noblest families of the English peerage are fully represented, a senator with a more venerable presence, or more dignified aspect, than the plebeian Joseph Hume—the son of the Montrose fisherman—the architect of his own fortune—and the vigilant guardian of the people's money.—*Reynolds's (London) Newspaper.*

CRIME IN THE OLDEN TIME.

It was only by severity of punishment that the legislators and administrators of the law in those days attempted to repress crime. When any offence increased to an inconvenient degree, it was made capital. At every assize and Old Bailey sessions the bulk of offenders were liable, on conviction, to undergo the penalty of death. But this severity, which rendered our penal code the most sanguinary in Europe, and called forth the mild censure even of Mr. Justice Blackstone (who draws attention to "the melancholy truth, that among the variety of actions that men are liable to commit, no less than a hundred and sixty have been declared by Act of parliament to be felonies, without benefit of clergy, or, in other words, to be worthy of instant death") it is needless to say, defeated its own object. The highwayman felt no hesitation in adding the crime of murder to that of robbery, when he knew it would not alter his punishment if detected. But the greatest mischief which resulted from this extreme severity of the laws, was the reluctance naturally felt by judges, juries and prosecutors, to carry them into execution. Technical objections of the most absurd description were permitted by the former to prevail. Juries stultified themselves, and disregarded the oath they had taken, by refusing to convict on the clearest evidence, or by committing the pious fraud of finding a £1 note of less value than 1s. All who could escape from prosecuting were too glad to avoid the terrible responsibility of sending a fellow-creature to the scaffold; and even when the thief had been brought to trial, the timid and the tender-hearted would often conceal some important fact to favour his acquittal. Such a state of things favoured the hardened criminal immensely. He chuckled when his counsel discovered a convenient flaw in the indictment, or adroitly managed to shut out some important evidence. But if defeated here, he had still the hope remaining that either the prosecutor or the jury would take a lenient view of his case, rather than have him hanged. If he had stolen a gentleman's watch or purse, and the facts were too clear to warrant an acquittal, still a merciful-minded jury would take the value of the articles into consideration, and solemnly declare that they were not worth a shilling. Instead of being hanged, he would then be sentenced to a whipping—a public whipping at the cart's tail. Although the sentence had a disagreeable sound, the thief chuckled again, for he knew that the flogging, like the trial would be only a farce. When the bare-backed ruffian was tied to the cart, his associates crowded the streets, jostled the hangman, and adroitly impeded his operations. If necessary a riot, upon a small scale was got up, to defeat the execution of the sentence; until at length the lucky thief, uninjured by the cat-o'-nine-tails, was untied from the cart, and perhaps the very same day renewed his trade of picking pockets. The whip was much in vogue at this period. If a prentice-lad got into bad company and robbed his master, he was publicly whipped through the street in which his master dwelt; and if he was not a hardened criminal, with hosts of abandoned associates to protect him, the lash was laid on with savage severity, whilst in character he was ruined and disgraced for life. Women, too, were publicly whipped at noonday through the crowded streets of London, in defiance of public decency and to the disgrace of the national character. And what was the result of these brutal punishments? Did they deter from the commission of crime, or excite a wholesome respect for the law and its administrators? The answer may be found in the criminal records of the period, which are filled with details of cruelty and brutality, happily unparalleled at the present day. We cannot refrain from noticing another mischievious consequence of the Draconian code of the eighteenth century; we allude to the frequency of capital punishments, and the disgraceful scenes by which they were attended; for, in spite of the difficulties interposed, there were of course many convictions, after which the law was generaly allowed to take its course. There is a grave doubt whether the infliction of capital punishment at all—even as that punishment is now inflicted, at rare intervals, and for atrocious crimes, has not a most demoralising effect. What, then, must have been the effect of the wholesale hangings of the period of which we are speaking, when men and women were executed by scores, and often for offences which would be now expiated by a few months' imprisonment? Henry Fielding was too sensible a man not to perceive the brutalizing tendency of these shameful scenes; but he does not appear to have felt that horror at the indiscriminate severity of the law which one would have expected. The coarse and common spectacle of a public execution he readily admitted was an unmixed evil; and for that objectionable spectacle he advocated the substitution of a more solemn and imposing show—fantastic and peculiar—but, to our mind, no less barbarous and revolting. His suggestion was as follows: "Suppose," he says, "that the court at the Old Baily was, at the end of the trials, to be adjourned during four days; that, against the adjournment day, a gallows was erected in the area before the court; that the criminals were all brought down on that day to receive sentence; and that this was executed the very moment after it was pronounced, in the sight and presence of the judges. Nothing can, I think, be imagined (not even torture, which I am an enemy to the very thought of admitting) more terrible than such an execution; and I leave it to any man to resolve himself upon reflection, whether such a day at the Old Bailey, or a holiday at Tyburn, would make the strongest impression on the mind of any man."—*Sharps Magazine.*

MODERN ATHENS.

Athens of the present day is a confused little town, containing some five-and-twenty thousand inhabitants. The dress of the people, who, from King Otho downwards, wear the elegant Albanian costume, with its gay jacket and snow-white kilt, gives the streets some appearance of brightness and life, but otherwise they are sombre and dirty enough. Public builings there are none worthy of notice, and the cathedral now in course of erection is the only church which can put forth any claims to architectural beauty. Unlike the Latin, which, be its faults what they may, has, in all ages, adorned with its shrines every land where it has held sway, the Greek Church has displayed in architecture, as in every thing else, the most wretched taste, whilst the interior of its sacred places are daubed over with paintings of the most paltry and miserable description. Such being the character of its externals, the ceremonial of the Greek religion is a melancholy and humiliating exhibition. We witnessed, while at Athens, the consecration of a bishop, conducted with all the pomp and circumstance that such an occasion called forth; but the ceremony was nevertheless paltry and unimposing. Many of the people, however, seemed much in earnest; the bands of the various bishops were devoutly kissed when the opportunity afforded, and not a few of the more fervent knelt down and pressed their lips to the ground upon which the patriarch had walked. As is the case during the ordinary services, the priests who officiated at the consecration often retired behind the screen which hides from the people what are considered the most sacred portions of the ceremonial, and, during their absence, a portion of Scripture was read, or rather drawled out through their noses, which consisted only of a single invocation to-alms giving, constantly repeated. Nothing can be more ludicrous and unpleasing than the intonation of the reading and chanting of the service, as well as the music of the Greek Church, each being a monotonous, tuneless howl or whine, issuing from the noses rather than mouths of the performers. Theoretically, the Church of Greece is not intolerant, and liberty of worship is guaranteed by the new constitution to persons of all religions, provided they do not proselytise. This clause has been made the pretext for the persecution of Dr. King, one of the excellent American missionaries now in Athens. Several Greeks having been in the habit of attending the services which he conducted in his own house he was arraigned before the Arcopagus, by which Court he was convicted of blasphemy, imprisoned and sentenced to banishment. The latter portion of the sentence the Ministry fear to put in force, in the face of an appeal to the American Government. I shall not linger among the ruins of ancient Athens. Since the revival of letters, they have been a marvel and a theme—the standard of a taste which in a great measure they have re-created. They are the only models of the sculptor and the architect, whose triumphs in modern days are measured by the comparative success with which they may imitate the unapproachable originals; and there are few cities in Europe so poor as not to boast of some humble copy of Athenian genius. Wasted by time, torn by war, and shattered by the wrack and ravage of long ages of barbarism, they are still the fairest structures that man has ever erected on the earth. Several of the minor monuments of antiquity are lost in the modern town, whilst several of them are covered by its filth; but the more important are unfortunately situated at some distance from it, and are scattered in a semicircle to the south of the city. The Tower of the Winds, an elegant octagonal building, has not had the fortune to escape the encroachment of the present town. Upon the sides of this temple are beautifully sculptured eight figures, happily emblematical of the like number of winds which blew from the points into which the Athenians divided the compass. On emerging from the streets and lanes, one of the oldest, and by far the best preserved, of all the temples of Athens meets the view. It is that with which the Athenians, in late repentance for the expulsion of Theseus, honoured the ashes of their king, carried hither from Skyros seven centuries after the death of the hero. It stands upon the slope of the low rocky hill which flanks Athens to the west, every point in the changeless surface of which is renowned in story, or famous by association with some immortal name. Here, hewn in the living rock, in the grand but simple theatre which resounded with the eloquence of Greece: the pedestal of the orator, and the seat of the listening crowd, remain. It was close by that Socrates was accused and condemned by a fickle people and unjust judge: his prison and his tomb are caverned in the rock. And, four centuries and a half after the wisest of Greeks had declared to the Athenians his reverence for divine authority, standing upon the same spot—for this rocky height is the Hill of Mars—the most eloquent of the Hebrews expounded to the men of Athens that Unknown God whom they "ignorantly worshiped." It was when gazing on the fanes of the gods of Greece—at his feet the columned dome sacred to Theseus, above him the Acropolis crowned with the fairest temples "ever made with hands"—that St. Paul declared to the assembled Greeks, that "the Lord of heaven and earth" dwelt not in these. It was under the shadow of Minerva of Phidias—a statue of gold and ivory, said to have fallen from heaven, the "protectress of the city," before whom incense ever burned, and on whose shrine offerings were ever laid—that the apostle showed, that "Giver of all things" was not to be worshipped with gifts, "as though he needed any thing," and that the Godhead is not like unto "gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." How hard for the Greeks, fallen though they were from their pride of place, to believe that all these ancient shrines, the work of glorious days, were vanity—their gods a dream, their worship folly!—*Hogg's Instructor.*

DISCRETION THE BETTER PART OF VALOUR.

Orloff! said Nicholas . . . . Sire . . . .
They tell me that the English fleet is at hand, commanded by that revolutionary demagogue, whom they call Sir Charles Napier.

They say so.

And that hostilities, in spite of my old friend, Aberdeen, may really be perpetrated by that anarchist.

There is too good reason to fear it.

In this grave conjuncture what ought I to do? Those Quakers whom I introduced to the Empress have not been of the slightest use. They have made themselves and me ridiculous. The dean good excellent Aberdeen, my old friend of forty years standing, does everything in his power. The good old soul is in his dotage. The court is with me, I know, but Albert must be circumspect. I expected something from Cobden. I took five hundred of his pamphlets, at two shillings a piece, with a discount for ready money. He offered me another five hundred at half-price, with a short-hand report of his famous speech on tea, coffee, and cakes. I declined, for five hundred of Cobden's pamphlets are, after all, no joke. My admirer, Earl Grey, and the reverend Mr. Bright (I wonder why they call him reverend), have undertaken to try the "Christian" "dodge," and enlist religious feeling in my favour. The worst of it is, the Atheists have got hold of the story of the Nuns of Minsk, of my persecution of the Lutherans, of my persecution of the Catholics, of my dragonades, bastonades, and wholesale conversions to the orthodox Greek Church, by the knout, at the cart's tail. What is your opinion, Orloff?

Your Majesty overwhelms me.

No doubt my ships could blow the English out of water. Still, if they dont, and are blown out of water themselves, the road to St. Petersburg is open. Orloff, I feel a strong desire to decamp—to cut, as I have heard those English say, to cut my imperial stick.

Sire, that is the word. Cut your Majesty's stick. We will both cut our sticks.

Wait a bit, Orloff. Let us talk the matter over.

Sire, we can do that as we go. The discussion would be safe as well as interesting.

Wait! There are two ways of decamping, Orloff—a vulgar and an imperial one. When the house of Romanoff cuts its stick, it cuts its stick imperially.

I think, for my part, I shall wait for Napier, and offer him a pinch of snuff.

For God's sake, Sire, don't. You are dreaming of Dundas. He, I am aware, is a friend, and would fire a salute in honour of your Majesty, and invite us to a cold collation. But Napier is a coarse John Bull. He was appointed by Palmerston, in spite of the good Aberdeen. Let us cut our stick. Don't think of the pinch of snuff.

There is much force in what you say; if I could only get ten minutes' conversation with my excellent old friend, I would make all right, and arrange the affairs of the sick man he and I talked of, to my perfect satisfaction. Ah! if we had only Dundas here, instead of this sanguinary demagogue.

Your Majesty is right. Let us cut our stick. The first impulse is usually the true one. Sire, we will cut our stick.

Orloff, your opinion coincides with mine. But an idea strikes me.

Then your Majesty will cut your stick?

Yes, I will think only of my subjects. And, in fact, whatever Europe may say, I will preserve myself for *it*—I am its sheet anchor.

You are, your Majesty.

If a bullet carried me off what would become of civilization? What would become of society?

Ah, Sire, what indeed?

Who would protect religion?

Who, Sire?

Who would restore (as my journal, the *Times*, pointedly and piously expressed it) the finest regions to a pure faith, and a mild and benevolent sway?

Capital, Sire, capital! Who would save property from red republicans, demagogues, and destructives?

Bravo!

Who would secure peace and prosperity from the eternal enemies of order?

Hurrah! Let us cut our stick.

Orloff, they tell me that these English revolutionists have projectiles of extraordinary force. I hear they have shells that would suffocate a regiment, and cannon of prodigious range!

True, Sire, these wretches have tremendous engines of destruction. Cut your Majesty's stick.

What was that, Orloff? Did you hear a report? Do you smell anything particular?

I do smell something, Sire; but the smell is not unfamiliar to me. Your Majesty *must* cut your stick.

Certainly, Orloff, certainly! This very instant!—*Charivari.*

AUTHORS AND ARTISTS AT FLORENCE.

A letter from Florence, published in the *Newark Advertiser*, has the following:

"Among the English authors living here are Mrs. Somerville, the Brownings, Charles Lever; Mr. Kirkup, the antiquarian; Mr. Tennyson, brother of the poet laureate, and who has himself a volume of poems now in press; and Mrs. Trollope, who made her *debut* in authorship through her libelous work on America. Since then her prolific brain has produced eighty-nine volumes of *so-so* tales, proving that "weeds grow apace." Not unproductively, however, for her, since she has reaped therefrom an abundant pecuniary harvest, and now occupies a beautiful villa, built by herself and her son, who is also a successful story teller. Mrs. Trollope has one of the largest and choicest of the private libraries in the city. The library room is an expansive gothic hall, the furniture being all after the antique, and decorated with statuary and paintings. In this hall she holds her Saturday morning receptions; and strange to say, she affects Americans so much as to hunt them up and load them with hospitalities. She is an affable, pleasant old lady, of about 70, and was probably more disgusted with her pecuniary misadventures in the United States than with the people she ridiculed in her spleen.

"Mrs. Somerville is now about seventy-three years old, in an excellent state of preservation, and is altogether a remarkable woman. She rises early, devotes her time till noon to scientific study and writing, and at other times occupies herself much with sketching from nature, painting in oil, embroidery; thus showing that the pursuit of mathematics is not incompatible with a love for the fine arts. No living woman ever received more flattering compliments from her own Government, and from great men of all nations, than Mrs. Sommerville; her bust stands in the British Academy by the side of Sir Isaac Newton's, and Baron Humboldt has called her "the greatest of women." She is perfectly simple and unostentatious in her manners, and never refers to her own labours, which, notwithstanding the extensive circulation of her works, have yielded her small pecuniary benefit. But she has a pension from the British Crown and lives here with her husband, a retired surgeon of the navy, and their own daughters, going much into society, being welcomed everywhere and admired for her quiet manners and agreeably conversation. Mr. Lever lives generously in a palace; gives dinners sparkling with his wit and wines; loves horses like a true Irish-Englishman; rides on the *cascine* with his rosy-cheeked daughters on either side of him, and is literally "a good fellow," his conversation being as full of humour as his Irish tales.

"Mr. Tennyson lives retired, though in easy and elegant circumstances, occupying a fine villa, filled with choice books and paintings. The Brownings still occupy the Casa Guidi, an old palace; never go into society, but receive their friends quietly in the evening. Mrs. B. is physically as frail as her mind and verse are strong; with such gentle, unpretending manners, and such a pleasant expression of face, that no one, to look at her, would believe that such force and passion could come out of such an apparently delicate, unperturbed nature. Mr. Browning is alive with good nature and humour; full of practical knowledge, and as plain and smooth in talk as he is obscure and rough in his writings; [?] in short, as is the case with Mrs. B., the very opposite of the book—Browning. Mr. Read, one of our American artists, now in Florence, has painted lately cabinet portraits of both, and they are truthful likenesses—they belong to a gentleman in Philadelphia, and will give all who see them their just notions of the originals.

"Mr. Read is now engaged upon several well-conceived compositions, which will do him credit. Mr. Edwin White of New York, who has been some years studying in France and Germany, is now here, painting successfully. He has conceived a series of pictures on American subjects—mostly scenes from the history of the Puritans—two of which are already done. His chief work, however, as yet, is a picture of Columbus taking the sacrament previous to embarking on his expedition in search of the New World. It is an effective painting, full of harmony; the "dim, religious light" of the sanctuary, the benignant countenance of the officiating priest, and the appearance of the great adventurer, humbly kneeling, whose face is solemn with prodigious intent, yet beaming with earnest faith, produces in the beholder a feeling in unison with the occasion, and one seems almost to hear the organ-tone timed to his own emotions while he gazes."

A PURITAN SUNDAY.

The Puritan Sabbath commenced on Saturday afternoon. No labour was performed on the evening which preceded the Lord's Day. Early on Sunday morning, the blowing of a horn, in some villages, announced that the hour of worship was at hand; in other places, a flag was hung out of the rude building occupied by the church. In Cambridge, a drum was beat, in military style. In Salem, a bell indicated the opulence of the settlement. The religious services usually commenced at nine o'clock in the morning, and occupied from six to eight hours, divided by an intermission of one hour for dinner. The people collected quite punctually, as the law compelled their attendance, and there was a heavy fine for any one that rode too fast to meeting. The sexton called upon the minister, and escorted him to church, in the same fashion that the sheriff now conducts the judge into our State courts. The minister was clothed with mysterious awe and great sanctity by the people; and so intense was this sentiment, that even the minister's family were regarded as demi-gods. The Puritan Meeting-House was an odd structure. The first ones erected by the colonists were built of logs, and had a cannon on the top. Those standing two centuries ago were built of brick, with clay plastered over the courses, and covered with clay-boards, now called clap-boards. The roof was thatched as buildings are now seen in Canada East. Near the church edifice stood those ancient institutions—the stocks—the whipping post—and a large wooden cage to confine offenders against the laws. Upon the outside of the church and fastened to the walls, were the heads of all the wolves killed during the season. In front of the church, in many towns, an armed sentry stood dressed in the habiliments of war. There were no pews in the church. The congregation had places assigned them upon the rude branches, at the annual town-meeting, according to their own social position. "Seating the meeting-house," as it was called, was delicate and difficult business, as pride, envy and jealousy were active passions in those days. A person was fined, if he occupied a seat assigned to another. The elders occupied seats beneath the pulpit. The boys were ordered to sit upon the gallery stairs, and as "boys always will be boys," three constables were employed to keep them in order. Prominent before the assembly some wretched male or female offender, sat with a scarlet letter "A" or "D;" on the breast, to denote some crime against the stern code. We make a few extracts from the laws of the New England colonies respecting the Sabbath:

"The Sabbath-day shall begin at sunset on Saturday."

"No woman shall kiss her children on the Sabbath or fasting day."

"No one shall run on the Sabbath-day, or walk in his own garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting."

"No one to cross the river, but with an authorized ferry man."—*Boston Transcript.*

A SERMON ON THE WORD 'MALT.'

PREACHED BY THE REV. MR. DODD, IN A HOLLOW TREE.

The following was preached more than thirty years ago, and as we believe such sentiments should have a resurrection, at least once in thirty years, we now give it publicity again for the benefit of those who cannot be reached by more formal preaching.

The Rev. Mr. Dodd, a very worthy minister, who lived a few miles from Cambridge, had rendered himself obnoxious to many of the cantabs by frequently preaching against drunkenness; several of whom meeting him on a journey, they determined to make him preach in a hollow tree which was near the road side. Accordingly, addressing him with great apparent politeness, they asked him if he had not lately preached much against drunkenness. On his replying in the affirmative, they insisted that he should now preach from a text of their choosing. In vain did he remonstate on the unreasonableness of expecting him to give them a discourse without study, and in such a place; but they were determined to take no denial, and the word MALT was given to him by way of text; on which he immediately delivered himself as follows:

"Beloved, let me crave your attention. I am a little man, come at a short warning, to preach a short sermon from a small subject, in an unworthy pulpit to a slender congregation. Beloved, my text is MALT; I cannot divide it into words, it being but one; nor into syllables, it being but one; I must, therefore, of necessity, divide it into letters, which I find to be these four, M—A—L—T. M, my beloved, is moral, A, is allegorical, L, literal, T, theological. The moral is set forth to teach you drunkards good manners; then M, masters, A, all of you, L, listen, T, to my text. The allegorical is when one thing is spoken and another thing is meant. The thing spoken is malt; the thing meant is the juice of malt; which you cantabs make, M, your master, A, your apparel, L, your liberty, T, your trust. The literal is, according to the letter, M, much, A, ale, L, little, T. trust. The theological is according to the effect that it works; and these I find of two kinds; first, in this world; secondly in the world to come. The effects that it works in this world are, in some, M, murder, in others, A, adultery, in all, L, looseness of life, and in some, T, treason. The effects that it works in the world to come, are M, misery, A, anguish, L, lamentation, and T, torment. And so much for this time and text. I shall improve this: first by way of exortation, M, masters, A, all of you, L, Leave off, T, tippling; or, secondly by way of excommunication, M, masters, A, all of you, L, look for, T, torment; thirdly, by way of caution, take this; a drunkard is the annoyance of modesty, the spoil of civility, the destruction of reason, the brewer's agent, the ale-house benefactor, his wife's sorrow, his children's trouble, his own shame, his neighbour's scoff, a walking swill-bowl, the picture of a beast, and the monster of a man."

He concluded in the usual form; and the young men, pleased with his ingenuity, not only sincerely thanked him, but absolutely profited more by this short and whimsical sermon, than by any serious discourse they ever heard.—*Old Penny Magazine.*

THE HEIR (HAIR) OF THE BOURBONS DETERMINED PHYSIOLOGICALLY.

A correspondent of the Philadelphia *Bulletin* returns to the old question, "Have we a Bourbon among us?" and gives a very decided negative to it, based on scientific ground. The heir of the Bourbon family is settled as follows:

By reference to Peter A. Browne's *Trichologia Mammalium*, a treatise on the organization, properties and uses of hair and wool, it will be seen that he has classed mankind (by their pile) into three species: the cylindrical piled man, the oval piled man and the eccentrically elliptical piled man. Mr. Browne has said, with great truth that the pile of the American Indian is always cylindrical; that of the white man is always an oval or an approach to the true oval; and that the wool of the negro is always eccentrically elliptical. This admits of no exceptions. By the diagram in Mr. Browne's book the reader will easily perceive the difference in the form of the pile of the three species of men. Mr. Browne, after great research and careful examination of many thousand specimens from all parts of the world, has discovered that these three types or pile, are to be considered the only ones found on the head of any of the human family. He has also observed, that in hybrids the pile not only preserves its type, but will be found to consist of a portion resembling that of each parent. For instance: A hybrid (father white and mother Indian), will have both cylindrical and oval pile. This will hold good no matter in what way the hybrid is compounded, even to the case of a hybrid born of white father and black mother, or a hybrid white, negro and Indian. In the latter case the three types of pile will be present. This may be set down without any doubt or exception, and no physiological fact has been more conclusively proved, than that an individual of mixed blood will have pile on his head to correspond with that of each of the types of which his blood is compounded. It can be safely said, that no cylindrical hair or pile can be found on the head of a man of purely white blood.

Louis the XVIth and Marie Antoinette were, without doubt, of pure white blood, and no child born of such parentage could have cylindrical pile. Mr. Browne has lately been presented with a lock of the hair of the Rev. Eleazer Williams and has subjected it to examination and measurement, by means of the microscope. The following is the result.

He found it consisted of cylindrical and oval pile, and did not discover any eccentrically elliptical. The several specimens of pile were of various calibre and four specimens measured as follows:

Diameters. { No. 1, cylindrical, 5½ millimetres—1-479 of an inch. No. 2, cylindrical, 4 millimetres—1-625 of an inch. No. 3, oval, 6½ by 4¼ millimetres—1-390 by 1-593 of an inch. No. 4, oval, 5 by 3½ millimetres—1-500 by 1-780 of an inch.

The cylindrical pile, although not amounting to one half of the hair in number, were found in profusion.

That the gentlemen does not exhibit in colour or conformation any of those striking features so peculiar to our aborigines (if that is the case), is not so wonderful. It is a physiological fact, that hybrids do not *always* exhibit by their colour or conformation the exact proportion of the blood of which they are compounded; but on the contrary, nature seems to delight in defeating these unnatural mixtures, and many times the product will exhibit almost exclusively the outward characteristics of the one parent, and at other times those of the other, so that no one would judge by the *appearance*, that the offsprings could be of the same parents.

This, however, is not a negative case, and Mr. Browne having discovered cylindrical pile in the lock of hair taken from the head of the reverend gentleman, is conclusive proof that he is partly of Indian origin, and, consequently, no Bourbon. Mr. Browne has, on several occasions, solved questions of pedigree; but this is the first time he has had occasion to decide a case of such great moment.

A Typographical Treasure.—Our readers have heard of a celebrated Publishing House—the first of which tradition speaks—known as the 'Devil & Dr. Faustus.' Though the senior member is believed to have had a large interest in many bibliopolic establishments of past ages, and to be equally concerned in the management and success of some of the present day, there is no volume existing which bear that of its junior partner. At a recent visit to the Astor Library we were shown one of the latter, which has but lately arrived from Paris. It is a bibliographic treasure of the very highest value, and possesses an unusual attraction for all who are interested in the history of the Art of Printing. The rubricated title at the head of the first leaf is as follows:

"Marci Tulii Ciceronis arpinatis consulisque romani ac oratorii maximi. Ad M. Tulium Ciceronem filium suum. Officiorum liber incipit. Prefatio generalis in libros omnes."

Like all very early printed books, it has no distinct title pages, no numbers of pages, no catch words, and no signature marks. Its size is a small folio, 9 3-4 inches high by 6 5-8 broad, having a side and bottom margin of 2 1-2 inches—that at the top being of 1 1-2 inches. The paper is very thick and strong and of a light cream colour; the type, although black letter, is very clear and distinct; and the book is, in every respect, as sound, as perfect and unsoiled as if it were printed yesterday; although, as will be seen by the following record of the date of its printing, it is nearly four hundred years old, having been issued within a few years after the invention of the art. The colophon (as the printer's record at the end of old books is called) gives, in red letters, the name of the printer, and the place, year and circumstances of the production of the volume, as follows:

"Presens Marci tulii clarissimum opus. Johannes fust Mogutinus civis, non atramento plumali canna neque aereo. Sed arte quadam perpulcra manu Petri de gernsheim pueri mei feliciter effeci finitum. Anno MCCCCLXVI. quarta die mensis februarii."

This in English is: I John Fust [Faustus], citizen of Mayenne, on this 4th day of February 1466, have successfully completed the present celebrated work of Marc Tully, not with ink in a pen of reed or brass, but by a certain very beautiful art, with the assistance of my apprentice Peter of Gernsheim [Schaeffer]."

One circumstance which adds to the value and interest of this uncommonly beautiful copy of an early fifteener (as bibliographers call books printed in the fifteenth century) is that its covers are stamped with the arms of Charles of Lorraine, Bishop of Metz, who was a grandson of Henry II. of France. The binding is dark brown calf, tooled in gold, in a rich though somewhat coarse manner. It is in the same fine preservation as the volume which it must have protected for two centuries and a half, as its possessor, for whom it was bound, died in 1607.—*Courier and Enquirer.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Disraeli the elder quotes an author who, in his *Elements of Education*, printed in 1640, says: "I have a favourable opinion of that young gentleman who is curious in fine mustaches. The time he employs in adjusting, dressing and curling them, is no time lost; for the more he contemplates his mustaches, the more his mind will cherish, and be animated by, masculine and courageous notions."

——The Devil.—The eminent antiquary, M. Merimee, informed the writer that he had observed a marked alteration in the mode of representing Satan in the carvings of the twelfth century; previously he had always been represented somewhat as a goat, but without a tail. This change took place at the period of the crusades. Might not the crusaders have seen the Assyrian Satan